DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 319 RE 003 164

TITLE	Factors of Educational Success in Reading: Disadvantaged Areas.
INSTITUTION	New York State Education Dept., Albany. Office of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	126p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.40
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Evaluation, Curriculum Evaluation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Evaluation, Faculty Evaluation, Inner City, Negro Youth, Program Evaluation, *Reading Achievement, Reading Programs, *Reading Research, Student Evaluation, *Urban Education

ABSTRACT

A joint study was undertaken by the Board of Education of the City of New York and the New York Education Department to compare pupil achievement in reading in selected schools in disadvantaged areas. Methods and procedures, administrative leadership, school-community relations, pupil attitudes, and staff attitudes were compared using standardized tests, projective techniques, and informal ratings. Results of the study showed that differences existed in all of these areas between those deprived schools in which pupils achieved well and those in which pupils were lacking in achievement. High-achieving schools seemed to be those which had greater numbers of middle-class Negroes, which were stocked with more materials, which had more independent and autonomous teachers, and which had more informal organization with less authoritarian administrations. Tables, questionnaires, interview guides, and observation guides are included. (MS)

ED045319

N-56

FACTORS OF EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS IN READING: DISADVANTAGED AREAS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Division of Research
Office of Research and Evaluation
New York State Education Department
March 1970

RE003 164

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND	1
	The Problem	1
	The Research Design	2
	Hypotheses	3
	Procedures	3
	Selection of Schools	5
II.	ANALYSIS OF SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES	11
	School Organizational Climate	11
	Evaluation of Administrative Performance	17
	The Influence of the School Community	21
	Peer Pupil Relationships in the Schools	27
III.	ANALYSIS OF THE READING PROGRAM	31
	Appraising Growth in Reading	31
	Observer Guide Reading	35
IV.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	47

APPENDIXES PAGE

A. Observer Guide-Reading 57

B. Appraising Growth in Reading: A System of Observation 73

C. Principal's Questionnaire 79

D. School Data Sheet. 84

E. Observer Interview Guide 86

F. School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide. 116

G. Comparison Form for School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide. .120

H. Class Sociometric Questionnaire. 121

I. Stern-Steinhoff Organizational Climate Index. 122
(Appendix I not reproduced.)

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.1	Comparison of Pairs of Schools Matched on Socio-economic Criteria With Differing Reading Achievement	7
1.2	Means, Standard Deviations and Group Comparisons (t) for Higher vs. Lower Achieving Schools on the Metropolitan Reading Test.	8
1.3	One-sided, Pair and Group Comparisons of Means for Higher vs. Lower Reading Achievement Schools for 1965, 1966, and 1967 PEP Reading Scores Combined	9
2.1	Pair, Two-tailed Significance Tests (t) for Six First Order Factors on the OCI.	14
2.2	Pair, Two-tailed Significance Tests (t) for Two Second Order Factors on the OCI	15
2.3	Group, Two-tailed Significance Tests (t) for Six First Order and Two Second Order Factors on the OCI	16
2.4	School-Community Coordinator Interviews, School Ratings by Interviewers, Selected Community Factors	24
2.5	Analysis of the Class Sociometric Questionnaire	29
3.1	Response Frequencies, Category Means and Significance Tests (t) for Appraising Growth in Reading	33
3.2	Chi-square for Each Area of Appraising Growth in Reading for Type A vs. Type B Schools	34
3.3	Observer-Guide Reading Response Frequencies for Type A and Type B Schools and Chi-squares for 2 x 3 Contingency Tables.	37

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

The results of the citywide standardized achievement tests in reading conducted annually in the New York City schools vary from school to school in generally predictable fashion. This fact is well known to the professional staff, and the records of the Bureau of Educational Research show that it has been true from the early days of standardized testing. The pattern of results is quite understandable in the light of what is known concerning the factors influencing test results.

Socioeconomic conditions exercise a strong effect on the success of children in school. Such potent causes as poverty, foreign language background, and poor health can greatly retard learning. Conversely, social advantages promote learning. In general, the scores on the citywide tests are lower in poor areas of the city, and higher in middle class and wealthy areas. Despite extra efforts and increased expenditures in schools in disadvantaged areas, the tendency persists for reading test results to vary with socioeconomic conditions.

The Problem

Against this well-established background of low test scores in schools in deprived areas, certain schools were noted to be exceptions. Although these schools in slum districts seemingly faced the same social obstacles to education, the school reading test results were somewhat better than had come to be expected for such schools. The provocative question suggested itself: What were the methods and procedures used in these exceptional schools which produced unexpectedly good results on the citywide reading tests? If the specific methods could be pinpointed, it might be possible to use this knowledge to improve education in other disadvantaged schools.

After exploratory discussion, it was decided to undertake a joint study sponsored by the Board of Education of the City of New York and the New York State Education Department. Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone, then Assistant Superintendent, Office of Research, and Dr. Lorne Woollatt, Associate Commissioner for Research and Evaluation, New York State Education Department, were asked to draw up a plan of evaluation for the approval of Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, then New York City Superintendent of Schools and Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., at that time Commissioner of Education of the State of New York. Dr. Seelig Lester, Deputy Superintendent for Instruction and Curriculum, was in charge of administrative aspects of the program for New York City. Dr. Richard McCowan was Chief of the Bureau of School and Cultural Research and administered the activities of the Education Department.

Research Design

In broad aspect the research design is based on a comparison of selected schools in disadvantaged areas. As planned, each pair of schools was chosen so as to be similar in the ethnic composition of the pupil population and low income status of the family. The two paired schools differed in that one had a record of higher scores. The specific method of selection will be described later in the report.

It is important to note that the study, as planned, includes the possibility that the schools which appear to be matched in socioeconomic status on the basis of normally available information, might in fact be found to differ in this respect after analysis of the more complete evidence revealed by this study.

Several hypotheses were postulated as to the causes of the differences in reading scores, and the hypotheses were tested by means of appropriate instruments and procedures.

Hypotheses

The main hypotheses formulated for the comparative study are listed below. Each is stated as a cause or condition to be evaluated as an explanation, or partial explanation, of the superiority of the reading scores of the high-achieving schools.

1. The methods and procedures of the reading program in the higher achieving school are superior.
2. The general educational program developed under the leadership of the principal is superior in the higher achieving school.
3. The higher achieving school enjoys more favorable community conditions and better school-community relations.
4. The psychological climate of the higher achieving school is superior in that the pupils exhibit better attitudes toward each other.
5. The psychological climate of the higher achieving school is superior in that the professional staff is motivated by attitudes more conducive to a good educational program.

Procedures

The procedures used to test the hypotheses will be briefly described in the order in which the hypotheses are listed above.

Methods and Procedures of the Reading Program--The main source of data was a day-long observation of the school reading program by teams of reading specialists. Each team was composed of one specialist from the New York City school system and one from the New York State Education Department. The observations were guided by a detailed evaluative checklist, Observer Guide-Reading, a copy of which is found in Appendix A.

In addition to the observations of the team of specialists, the teachers in the higher and lower achieving schools described their own reading programs concerning the type of teaching method emphasized. They followed the check list Appraising Growth in Reading, which appears in Appendix B.

The General School Program--A team of supervisors of elementary education from the State Education Department assessed the leadership of the principal and his supervisory staff and their success in administration and supervision by means of a study of the school's educational program as a whole. The supervisors visited the schools, observed the school program in action, and conducted an extensive interview of the principals. The observational visit was preceded by a study of the results of a Principal's Questionnaire (Appendix C) and a School Data Sheet (Appendix D) provided by the Bureau of Educational Research. The initial information provided by the two latter instruments included such items as pupil register, pupil mobility, teaching and supervisory staff, and school participation in special programs such as Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I projects. An Observer Interview Guide (Appendix E) was designed to structure the observations of the supervisors. Initially 37 categories were identified and described. These were later reduced to 26 categories each of which was evaluated on a five point rating scale from "low" to "high." Paragraphs describing "low" and "high" designations are included for each category.

The elementary supervisors made evaluative judgments and a critique of the general school educational program on the basis of the above data.

School Community--The influence of the school community on the educational program, and thus on reading, was investigated by means of

interviews of the school community coordinators familiar with the schools concerned. The interviewers were staff members of the Bureau of Educational Research. The interview generally followed the School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide (Appendix F). The results were analyzed by the interviewers as specified in a comparison form (Appendix G). The community was considered both from the physical environment, and as to the quality of community relations.

Pupil Peer Relationships--The climate of the schools in terms of the psychological relationship existing among the pupils was studied by means of the administration and analysis of the Class Sociometric Questionnaire (Appendix H), a refinement of the widely used Ohio Social Acceptance Scale in all fifth grade classes.

School Organizational Climate--Using the Stern-Steinhoff Organizational Climate Index (Appendix I) the organizational climate was measured for the schools being compared. The Index derives from the needs-press concepts of H.A. Murray and provides index ratings of a variety of school environmental aspects. These indices were used to compare the higher achieving and the lower achieving schools.

Selection of Schools

In the initial selection of schools for the study, two indices were used: the ethnic distribution of the pupil register and the percent of pupils eligible for free lunch. The criterion for the initial screening for ethnic distribution was that a selected school have no more than 10 percent of the pupil register in the category "Other." The category "Other" includes all ethnic categories other than Negro and Puerto Rican and is predominantly White. The percent of children eligible for free lunch was used as an index of the low income status of the school. The selection limit set in this regard was that at least 25 percent of the pupil register be eligible for free lunch.

Table 1.2

Means, Standard Deviations, and Group Comparisons (t) for Higher vs. Lower Reading Achievement Schools on the Metropolitan Reading Test

		October 1966			April 1967		
Grade		Mean	S.D.	t^a	Mean	S.D.	t^a
2	Hi	1.867	0.125	2.739*	2.88	0.339	3.17**
	Low	1.683	0.107		2.35	0.229	
3	Hi	2.550	0.206	1.922*	3.52	0.273	2.32*
	Low	2.350	0.150		3.17	0.249	
4	Hi	3.583	0.445	2.234*	4.43	0.471	2.92**
	Low	3.133	0.213		3.73	0.349	

[a] one sided comparison, df=10

**p < .01

*p < .05

Table 1.3 presents data for grades 1 and 3 on the New York State PEP tests for years 1965, 1966, and 1967 combined. Pair significance tests were made on the mean of means for the 3 years prior to the initiation of this study. Grade 1 pair differences were not significant. This conforms to expectation, i.e., reading growth is a function of the school program. The grade 1 scores reflect the influence of the home and environment. Since these were essentially the same for both groups of schools, significant differences would not be expected. The group comparison of differences produced results identical with the pair tests, i.e., no significant grade 1 differences but significant grade 3 differences.

It is evident from tables 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 that the schools selected for the study are similar in ethnic and socioeconomic measures and different in terms of their reading levels. The purpose of this study is to determine why these differences do in fact exist between the two groups of schools.

Table 1.3

One-sided, Pair, and Group Comparisons of Means for
Higher vs. Lower Reading Achievement Schools
for 1965, 1966, and 1967 PEP Reading Scores Combined

Pair		Pupil Evaluation Program Reading 1965, 1966, and 1967 Mean Schools Combined Grade 1			Grade 3		
		Mean	S.D.	t[a]	Mean	S.D.	t[a]
1	Hi	39.44	16.09	-0.06	27.26	11.00	13.12**
	Low	39.51	14.67		17.89	9.96	
2	Hi	42.2	24.11	1.38	23.70	12.8	3.05**
	Low	40.2	21.41		21.26	12.25	
3	Hi	35.99	17.71	1.37	18.87	11.56	6.31**
	Low	34.38	17.41		14.71	9.55	
4	Hi	38.73	16.66	1.20	23.76	12.04	5.75**
	Low	37.46	14.78		19.43	10.12	
5	Hi	37.24	14.16	1.28	19.57	10.08	2.20*
	Low	35.53	17.37		17.73	9.85	
6	Hi	45.58	17.37	7.6**	28.32	11.75	8.25**
	Low	39.52	16.54		21.80	10.5	
Hi Group		39.70	4.55	0.937	23.58	3.52	2.75*
Low Group		37.77	2.18		18.80	2.39	

a df 120 in pair comparison
df=10 in group comparison

**p $<$.01
*p $<$.05

CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

Four areas were examined for their ability to account for the observed differences in reading achievement between the schools matched on socio-ethnic-economic variables. These were: Organizational Climate of the Schools; Administrative Performance; School Community Influences; and Peer-Pupil Relationships within the schools.

Organizational Climate of the Schools

Organizational Climate refers to the "personality" of an organization. The personality structure of an individual can be assessed, at least in part, by asking him to describe his interests and preferences for different kinds of activities, utilizing a particular theoretical construct. Similarly, data may be obtained concerning the characteristics of an organization and the behavior of people in it from the systematic reports of an observer or from the analysis of the consensual responses of individuals working in the organization to questions dealing with its policies, procedures, and activities.

The Stern-Steinhoff Organizational Climate Index (OCI) (Appendix I) consists of 300 statements which describe the environment in which people work. They are statements which refer to daily activities, rules, regulations and policies, to typical interests and projects, and to features of the physical environment.

The OCI yields 30 scales which have been factor analyzed to six first order factors which will be enumerated below. The first five factors combine to form a second order factor (Area I) called Development Press which denotes the capacity of the organizational environment

to support, satisfy, or reward self-actualizing behavior. The combination of factors one and two combined with factor six form another second order factor (Area II) described as Control Press, which refers to those characteristics of environmental press which inhibit or control personal expressiveness. The six first order factors are:

1) Intellectual Climate--concerns intellectual activity social action, and personal effectiveness

2) Achievement Standards--reflects press for achievement related to hard work, perserverance, etc.

3) Practicalness--an environmental dimension of practicality tempered with friendliness

4) Supportiveness--deals with aspects of the organizational environment that respects the integrity of the teacher as a person, but with the implication that dependency needs are supported rather than personal autonomy

5) Orderliness--concerns the press for organizational structure, procedure, orderliness, and a respect for authority

6) Impulse Control--refers to a high level of constraint and organizational restrictiveness.

The Organizational Climate Index was used to compare the higher achieving school with the lower achieving school on the degree to which the six basic factors and two areas are present or absent in each of the 10 sample schools. The purpose of the analysis of these factors in each of the five pairs of schools is to determine how organizational climate relates to the difference in academic achievement between the lower achieving and higher achieving schools. There are two principal questions involved. First, is there a significant difference between the paired schools on the six factors and two areas which constitute the organizational climate in the schools? Secondly, how is the organizational climate related to the differences in achievement between the five pairs of schools?

The Organizational Climate Index was distributed to all teachers of the six pairs of schools by their building principals. Each teacher and principal received a copy of the OCI and a detailed set of instructions. The respondents did not have to identify themselves by name. The completed questionnaires were returned to the Bureau of Educational Research by the building principals.

A total of 430 teachers and principals completed the OCI. Of the 12 schools in the sample, 10 provided a sufficient response to be included in the analysis. Interpretation of these data, therefore, must take into account the representativeness of the subgroups completing the questionnaire.

Table 2.1 presents the means, standard deviations, and two-tailed significance test (t) for the six first order factors of the OCI for five of the six pairs of schools in the study. Pair A_1, B_1 was omitted since there was an insufficient response to analyze. Table 2.2 presents the same statistics for the two second order factors. The results of this analysis are ambiguous and difficult to interpret clearly since the same factor was significant in different directions in many cases. The means and variances were combined to overcome this difficulty and to enable group comparisons. These are presented in table 2.3. Three first order factors emerged from the analysis as being significant. In the lower achieving schools, the supportiveness, orderliness, and impulse control factor scores were significantly higher than in the higher achieving schools. Significant group differences were found for Area 1, Developmental Press, a second order factor. An inspection of means reveals that the lower achieving schools have higher Developmental Press scores.

TABLE 2.1

Pair, Two-tailed Significance Tests (t) for
Six First Order Factors on the OCI

VARIABLES	A_2	B_2	A_3	B_3	A_4	B_4	A_5	B_5	A_6	B_6
	N=52		N=44		N=56		N=21		N=15	
Intellectual Climate:										
Mean	52.385	43.838	46.023	49.356	57.732	54.857	34.286	48.438	44.133	48.135
St. Dev.	13.236	17.937	14.417	13.543	12.017	14.825	14.873	14.791	10.776	19.159
t	2.588*		-1.302		1.097		-3.399 **		-0.759	
Achievement Standards										
Mean	33.000	28.838	27.886	29.977	37.214	31.837	22.857	30.313	27.133	29.054
St. Dev.	6.733	10.671	7.972	7.870	5.920	7.154	7.774	9.163	7.049	9.623
t	2.254*		-1.430		4.214**		-3.071**		-0.699	
Practicalness:										
Mean	13.788	11.297	12.295	13.391	13.179	13.490	9.286	13.625	11.800	12.459
St. Dev.	2.468	3.365	3.625	2.793	2.321	3.063	3.289	2.780	2.808	3.579
t	4.031**		-1.913		-0.591		-5.169 **		-0.637	
Supportiveness:										
Mean	60.827	57.757	50.114	58.506	53.536	63.204	44.333	60.750	56.467	57.568
St. Dev.	12.181	12.960	14.335	12.402	13.673	11.795	18.161	12.629	9.665	15.605
t	1.141		-3.469**		-3.852**		-3.886**		-0.253	
Orderliness:										
Mean	35.904	36.054	30.682	37.517	27.357	40.224	35.190	36.594	37.267	35.108
St. Dev.	8.673	8.550	8.850	6.536	8.529	6.884	9.688	8.104	7.056	5.703
t	-0.081		-5.001**		-8.427**		-0.570		3.210**	
Impulse Control:										
Mean	30.519	34.243	29.136	28.184	24.196	32.265	42.095	34.938	36.667	30.378
St. Dev.	6.563	6.894	5.785	6.512	5.408	6.197	5.873	7.229	7.916	5.703
t	-2.584*		0.820		-7.125**		3.787**		3.210**	

*<.01
**<.05

TABLE 2.2

Pair, Two-Tailed Significance Tests (t) for Two
Second Order Factors on the OCI

AREA	A_2 / B_2 N=52	A_3 / B_3 N=44	A_4 / B_4 N=56	A_5 / B_5 N=21	A_6 / B_6 N=15
I--Development Press:					
Mean	195.904 177.784	167.000 188.747	189.018 203.612	145.[illegible] 189.719	176.800 182.324
St. Dev.	37.078 49.292	42.924 35.603	34.518 37.362	49.502 42.000	31.168 53.754
t	1.980*	-3.077**	-2.080*	-3.456**	-0.372
II--Control Press:					
Mean	85.135 101.568	95.277 88.851	69.250 85.571	124.952 96.188	105.400 93.189
St. Dev.	20.477 32.483	21.769 23.028	18.053 23.754	24.620 27.885	21.590 30.796
t	-2.925**	1.524	-3.991**	3.843**	1.399

*<.01
**<.05

TABLE 2.3

Group, Two-tailed Significance Tests (t) for Six First Order and Two Second Order Factors on the OCI

OCI Factor	Higher Achieving Schools		Lower Achieving Schools		t
	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	$\bar{X}$	S.D.	
Intellectual	49.686	14.90	49.268	16.222	0.260202
Achievement	31.4572	8.41795	30.1799	8.81473	1.43687
Practicalness	12.5957	3.13272	12.7931	3.21955	-0.60252
Supportiveness	53.9576	14.5785	59.8741	12.7633	-4.18675**
Orderliness	32.1649	9.3877	37.6234	7.51643	-6.22343**
Impulse Control	30.0955	8.16993	32.005	6.93245	-2.44352*
Area I					
Development Press	179.984	41.8248	189.739	46.2631	-2.22275*
Area II					
Control Press	88.8415	26.7553	92.5571	27.7807	-1.32088

** $<.01$
* $<.05$

The organizational climate of the lower achieving schools, based on the evidence described, is one in which personal needs are supported (Supportiveness). There is a press for organizational structure, procedure, orderliness, respect for authority, and a high level of constraint and organizational restrictiveness (Impulse Control). In general, the organizational climate in low achieving schools is one which supports, satisfies, and rewards conforming behavior.

Evaluation of Administrative Performance

It must be noted that all conclusions in the evaluation of administrative performance, although made by highly qualified, experienced supervisors, are subject to one or more of the following limitations:

1. The length of time available for observations in each school was limited to 1 day

2. No reliability data are available since only one observer visited each school

3. The conclusions are somewhat limited by the validity of the instrument entitled Observer Interview Guide

4. The observations were designed to ascertain from the principal responsible for the instructional program those features which contributed to the academic performance of the children. However, in several situations the principals were new to the school and had been in the position for less than a semester. In one case, the principal had only been in the school for 3 weeks.

Characteristics of Lower Achieving Schools--The observers concluded that principals in low achieving schools differed from those in higher achieving schools in certain characteristics. Negative characteristics were observed in the lower achieving schools collectively and were not necessarily present in each school. Although negative characteristics were also observed in higher achieving schools, they were less frequent and pervasive than in lower achieving schools.

Academic success was limited in schools in which principals were committed to the status quo and readily accepted low levels of student

attempted to use team planning in coordinating instruction. Library programs were more active and involved larger numbers of students.

Parental involvement was positive and directed toward specific achievement goals. Such purposeful involvement seemed to contribute to a cooperative attitude on the part of the parents, who tended to reinforce the objectives of the schools. Student and parental values in higher achieving schools conformed more to expected, traditional, and middle class attitudes. Parents were more intimately involved by the staff in discussing school programs, but neither category of school enabled parent groups to participate in forming policy or determining curriculum.

Certain administrative characteristics were identified in several of the more educationally successful schools. A transactional leadership style in which there was a sharp definition of institutional expectations without limiting the individually of personnel existed. Leadership tended to be strong, and at times, almost authoritarian. The most effective principals were highly organized, seemed able to handle conflicts easily and created challenging goals for the staff. Efforts were made to set performance standards and develop a continuous evaluative program. Test results were analyzed carefully and pertinent information was provided for the teachers. The majority of the principals in the more successful schools were proud of their rapport with teachers and parents and attempted to establish a close relationship with the staff by participating in activities such as playing bridge or eating lunch together.

Although not all principals in higher achieving schools were equally competent, a greater number of characteristics which seemed to contribute to student growth were observed among this group. In general, they were

more devoted to the welfare of the staff and the students. Although the organizational climate of their schools tended to be more authoritarian and more highly structured, greater interest was exhibited in innovative programs. However, the observations were not uniformly consistent and in certain cases negative characteristics were observed. Conversely, while the principals in the lower achieving schools exhibited undesirable characteristics much more consistently, in certain aspects of their performance some individuals surpassed administrators in the higher achieving schools.

The Influence of the School Community

The pairs of schools studied were matched in ethnic composition and in terms of the proportion of pupils eligible to receive free lunch. While these two matching indices are related to the socioeconomic status of the pupil population, it is recognized that it is quite possible for the schools of each pair to differ in socioeconomic status, despite similarity in the two indices used.

Indeed, one of the hypotheses of the study is that the schools excelling in reading may have benefited from better community conditions. There is clear evidence from previous research that the quality of community support can affect pupil achievement markedly. For example, negative support may take the extreme form of a school boycott which virtually puts a complete stop to academic improvement. Less dramatic, but still very potent, are such community forces as parental support of the school program and general community attitudes toward school activities, school attendance, and the support of the teaching and supervisory staff. More impersonal factors such as poor housing, poverty, population density, and other ghetto disadvantages also have a strong, even if indirect, effect on pupil achievement.

The community influences may be divided into two categories. The first comprises those community elements which are part of the relatively permanent physical and social environment and subject to change only after long and difficult effort involving rebuilding and redevelopment. The second category includes the community attitudes, which, to some extent, can be influenced by the school staff by means of pupil activities, school functions, parent organizations, and other aspects of school-community relations.

The source of school-community data for the present study was an interview of the school-community coordinator. The professional employees serving in the position of school-community coordinator have special skills in this function and devote full time to the activity. The coordinator familiar with each of the six pairs of schools in the comparison groups was selected, in each case, by the assistant superintendent in charge of all school-community coordinators.

Qualified research associates and research assistants of the Bureau of Educational Research interviewed the school-community coordinators, using the School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide (Appendix F).

Conferences with the interviewers were held at the Bureau of Educational Research both before and after the interviews.

After the final conference, the interviewers analyzed the results of the interviews on the basis of the responses included on the Interview Guide, their notes, and their recall of the interview. The basis for the analysis was the Interview Comparison Form (Appendix G).

Neither the interviewers nor the school-community coordinators knew at anytime during the judging and the analysis of the results which school had been selected as the relatively high achieving member of the pair of

schools.

Table 2.4 summarizes the results of the analysis of the school-community coordinator interviews.

Quality of Housing--Considering the schools as a group, there is little difference in the judgments as to quality of family housing between the higher and lower achieving schools. Of the six comparisons, three favored the higher achieving schools, two favored the lower achieving schools and one pair was judged equal.

General Living Conditions--Judgments concerning the general living conditions of the school communities follow a pattern similar to that found for quality of housing. Considering the schools as a group, three higher achieving schools were judged superior, one lower achieving school was superior, and for two pairs there was no difference.

Community Attitudes--The results of the interviews were analyzed for four aspects of community attitudes: extent of parent participation; school efforts to secure cooperation; parent image of the school; and support of the school by community organizations.

There was very little difference between higher achieving and lower achieving schools in extent of parent participation. Study of table 2.4 does reveal that the higher achieving schools are rated superior in desirable attitudes existing between school and community.

Individual School Trends--The full value of the detailed information provided by school-community coordinator interviewers is best realized by consideration of individual school pairs. Each pair may be compared in terms of the results for these two schools as analyzed in the ratings given in table 2.4, amplified by the details of the interview protocols.

School A_1 and School B_1 --In the design of the experiment, the Superintendent of Schools requested that School A_1 be included because

TABLE 2.4

School-Community Coordinator Interviews
School Ratings by Interviewers
Selected Community Factors

	Schools[1]											
	A_1	B_1	A_2	B_2	A_3	B_3	A_4	B_4	A_5	B_5	A_6	B_6
Quality of Housing	V			S	-	-	M			M	M	
General Living Conditions	V		-	-	-	-	V			M	S	
Extent of Parent Participation	-	-	-	-	S		S		-	-	-	-
School Efforts to Secure Cooperation	-	-	V		S		V			V	V	
Parental Image of the School	V		M		S		V			V	V	
Support by Community Organization	M		S		-	-	-	-	S		M	

[1] A schools denote the higher achieving school. The subscript denotes the pair number.

S Slightly Superior
M Moderately Superior
V Very Superior
- Neither School Superior

of its excellent scholastic record for a disadvantaged school. The matched School B_1, although considered the best match available, is not an exact counterpart.

On the basis of the school-community coordinator interviews it is clear that School A_1 enjoys a community environment definitely superior to that of School B_1. Many families in School A_1, although Negro, are middle class. This is not true for School B_1. It is also evident from the interviews that the principal of School A_1 exerts a strong influence on the school, which is universally considered the best school in that Harlem district. School B_1, on the other hand, suffers from every disadvantage associated with the ghetto.

School A_2 and School B_2--School A_2 was also selected by the Superintendent of Schools to be included in the study in view of its record, and School B_2 was chosen to match School A_2. The two schools seem well matched in terms of general character of the area. The main difference appears to be the energy and innovative spirit of the principal of School A_2. The school has several special programs such as Headstart and Prekindergarten, and concentrates on the reading program. The following is a quotation from the interview of the School-Community Coordinator:

> At School A_2, the reading program is extremely successful. Children are learning how to read. Everyone wants to attend the school. Principal at School B_2 is a good 'Ole Time Administrator.' He's not been involved in the community.

School A_3 and School B_3--This pair of schools appears closely matched as to type of surrounding community. However, the parents are more favorable to the school in the case of School A_3. "This is largely due to the success of the principal in recruiting a good school staff."

School A_4 and School B_4--Both of these schools are almost entirely Negro. There are some middle class elements in both school zones. The main difference between the two schools is a very favorable parent attitude to School A_4 and an unfavorable attitude to School B_4. In School A_4, parents' meetings are described as "fabulous" by the School-Community Coordinator--100-200 parents per meeting. This is attributed to active community participation by the principal. "He is a dedicated school man with primary concern for educating the children well. This requires community involvement, and he is willing."

School A_5 and School B_5--Although these two schools are very similar in ethnic composition, there are more pupils on free lunch in School A_5 (67 percent versus 32 percent). However, since School A_5 is the higher achieving school having the greater percent of pupils on free lunch, the school is superior in reading to School B_5 in spite of any presumed advantage on the part of School B_5, because it had fewer low income children. It will be noted from table 2.4 that School A_5 is considered by the School-Community Coordinator to have the advantage in community conditions and attitudes.

Perusal of the interview protocols reveals no details which might provide a possible explanation for the superiority of School A_5 in reading. The School-Community Coordinator explained that there is considerable contention between the school board and the parents of School A_5. "The parents consider this school, rightly or wrongly, an example of what they don't want."

School A_6 and School B_6--The school community conditions as revealed by the interviews do not indicate an advantage in this respect for either school of the pair. As is indicated in table 2.4, School A_6 is moderately

superior in general living conditions. On the other hand, School B_6 has a distinctly superior image among parents and community.

Analysis of the interview details also makes clear that in the comparison of this pair of schools, the influence of the principal cannot be considered superior in the case of School A_6. The evidence is that the actions of the principal of School B_6 are superior in enlisting community support. The explanation of the superior reading scores in School A_6 must be sought in factors other than school-community conditions.

Peer Pupil Relationships in the Schools

One of the research hypotheses of the study is that the level of reading achievement in the school is influenced by the quality of children's peer relationships. Smooth and friendly pupil relationships may be assumed to promote learning and achievement, while friction and unfriendly attitudes retard achievement.

The sociometric characteristics of the experimental and control schools were surveyed by means of the Class Sociometric Questionnaire (Appendix H). In each of the 12 schools, the fifth grade was selected as representative of the school as a whole. All fifth grade classes were surveyed except junior guidance classes and classes for the physically handicapped.

The Class Sociometric Questionnaire consisted of a five-point scale (continuum) designed to measure the extent to which preadolescents accept their peers and are, in turn, accepted by them. It is a refinement and extension of the widely-used Ohio Social Acceptance Scale. The scale discriminates between five degrees of social distance (three accepting, one noncommittal, and one rejective). The scale requires every subject to give each of the other members of his class a rating of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 depending on the extent to which he socially desires them. The

meanings attached to the ratings are as follows:

Scale Value	Meaning
1	Very, very best friend
2	Good friends
3	Not friends, but okay
4	Don't know them
5	Not okay

Simple explanations of the five rating categories which define their meaning are presented to each pupil. Each pupil is thus able to understand the meaning of the values available for him to assign to his groupmates.

Table 2.5 indicates the number of pupils studied, number of sociometric ratings analyzed and the mean value of peer rating. As may be noted, the number of pupils in the higher achieving schools virtually equalled the number of pupils in lower achieving schools. Since a 50 percent sample was taken, the number of fifth-grade pupils in each of the schools participating in the research was actually twice as great as the figure indicated.

Every pupil represented in table 2.5 was asked to rate all of the other members of his class, and the total number of these ratings was analyzed. The number of sociometric ratings analyzed greatly exceeded the number of pupils studied.

The number of sociometric ratings analyzed in the higher achieving schools was approximately equal to the number of sociometric ratings analyzed in the lower achieving schools. A Kruskal-Wallis, a one-way nonparametric analysis of variance based on rankings, was applied to determine the statistical significance of differences observed between the sociometric data collected for both groups of schools studied. The 5 percent level of confidence was selected.

TABLE 2.5

Analysis of the
Class Sociometric Questionnaire

School Pairs	Number of Pupils Studied	No. of Sociometric Ratings Analyzed	Mean Value of Peer Ratings
A_1	67	1,967	3.13
B_1	46	1,005	2.83
A_2	80	2,128	2.61
B_2	74	2,338	2.74
A_3	63	1,793	2.85
B_3	48	1,263	2.64
A_4	91	2,499	2.88
B_4	61	1,681	2.90
A_5	46	1,272	2.56
B_5	113	3,076	2.78
A_6	49	1,245	2.73
B_6	60	1,583	2.59
TOTALS: A	396	10,904	2.81
TOTALS: B	402	10,946	2.75

54 teachers in Type A schools and 54 teachers in Type B schools.

The responses were tallied and combined into three categories: 1) Little or No Emphasis, 2) Moderate Emphasis and 3) Heavy Emphasis. These categories were assigned score weights of 1, 2, and 3 respectively. The data were then analyzed using t-tests and chi-squares.

Table 3.1 presents the response frequencies, category mean scores and their standard deviations for the nine categories rated. The items which comprise each category are also entered in the table. The critical ratios (t-test for independent groups) for the mean differences were highly significant for all categories. The teachers representing Type A schools, whose reading achievement significantly exceeded the Type B schools, consistently rated all aspects of their reading program higher than those in the Type B schools. The fact that Type A teachers had a higher opinion of their reading program than Type B teachers may be due either to a faithful reporting of the truth or an extraneous group factor, such as administrative climate or esprit de corps. In either case, the differences were significant and favored those classes in which the students actually attained higher reading scores.

The individual items rated by the teachers were also examined for significant differences. A 2 x 3 contingency table was constructed for each of the 46 items. The cells were loaded with the observed response frequencies for each increment of the emphasis scale. Table 3.2 presents the results of this analysis.

Significant chi-squares were found for more than half of the areas on which the classroom teachers rated themselves. In all of these cases, the ratings of teachers in A schools exceeded the ratings of teachers in B schools. The chi-squares for every area under the categories of Experiential Reading, Teaching Method and Teacher Characteristics were significant.

TABLE 3.1

Response Frequencies, Category Means and Significance Tests (t)
for Appraising Growth in Reading

Category (Items)	Description of Category	School Type	Little or No Emphasis (1)	Moderate Emphasis (2)	Heavy Emphasis (3)	Mean Score	S.D.	t
1 (1-5)	Experiential Reading	A	15	74	176	2.61	.593	8.70***
		B	63	117	90	2.10	.746	
2 (6-13)	Silent Reading Comprehension	A	44	104	285	2.56	.671	3.55***
		B	65	135	232	2.39	.733	
3 (14-18)	Facility in Oral Reading	A	18	74	117	2.59	.613	3.87***
		B	24	119	127	2.38	.643	
4 (19-25)	Vocabulary Development	A	32	71	273	2.64	.633	3.39**
		B	56	68	210	2.46	.764	
5 (26-30)	Use of Books	A	34	81	155	2.45	.707	3.50***
		B	55	99	116	2.23	.763	
6 (31-34)	Teaching Method	A	43	52	109	2.32	.800	4.89***
		B	75	75	62	1.94	.801	
7 (35-37)	Pupil Growth	A	8	41	113	2.65	.572	3.59***
		B	19	60	83	2.40	.688	
8 (38-40)	Teacher Characteristics	A	67	26	61	1.96	.911	4.99***
		B	110	20	28	1.48	.777	
9 (41-46)	Environment	A	56	51	216	2.49	.772	3.46***
		B	97	82	144	2.15	.851	

***<.001
** <.01

TABLE 3.2

Chi-squares for Each Area of Appraising Growth in Reading
for Type A vs. Type B Schools

CATEGORY	x^2	CATEGORY	x^2
I. Experiential Reading:		V. Use of Books:	
1. Observing	16.2**	26. Handle books	2.5
2. Gathering relevant information	17.1**	27. Use table of contents & index	11.7**
3. Recording information	22.1**	28. Use library skills	3.1
4. Remembering information	12.3**	29. Use various kinds of books	1.4
5. Using information	3.4	30. Demonstrates the ability to follow instructions	.04
II. Comprehension in Silent Reading:		VI. Teaching Method:	
6. Noting details	2.6	31. Teacher-pupil planning	8.9*
7. Interpreting ideas	1.1	32. Community & school resources	12.7**
8. Locating main ideas	0.9	33. Independent study for pupils	7.0*
9. Finding answers to questions	4.6	34. Other: describe in "Comments"	23.7*
10. Verifying a given statement	8.2*		
11. Judging value & accuracy of material	5.3	VII. Pupil Growth:	
12. Reading for pleasure	3.8	35. Interest & enjoyment	2.7
13. Reading to follow directions	6.2*	36. Pupils helping themselves	4.7
III. Facility in Oral Reading:		37. Good eye movement, lack of vocalization	7.5*
14. Reading Accurately	2.9	VIII. Teacher Characteristics:	
15. Phrasing fluently	6.3*	38. Taken a workshop course in reading in the last three years	10.0*
16. Using appropriate expression	9.6**	39. Visit or observed reading in other classes	18.5**
17. Recognizing new words	2.5	40. Consistently used reading clinic	7.4*
18. Making use of punctuation marks	3.9	IX. Environment:	
IV. Vocabulary Development:		41. Displays to motivate reading	13.6*
19. Word analysis-auditory discrimination	1.4	42. Library	1.6
20. Word analysis-visual discrimination	1.7	43. Magazine subscriptions	12.0**
21. Word analysis-phonetic analysis & blending	0.3	44. Bulletin boards devoted to reading	7.6*
22. Word recognition-sight vocabulary	5.9	45. Book clubs	11.2**
23. Word meaning-contextual clues	8.4*	46. Reading table or area	6.2*
24. Word meaning-synonyms, antonyms, homonyms	9.3**		
25. Use of dictionary-pronunciation & location skills	8.5*		

** $<.01$
* $<.05$

All areas rated under the category of Environment with the exception of Library had significant chi-squares. Throughout, the teachers in Type A schools had a higher regard or opinion of their reading program than did teachers in Type B schools.

Observer Guide-Reading

Classroom observations were conducted by teams of reading supervisors made up of a staff member from the State Education Department and the New York City Board of Education. Each supervisor had extensive experience both in the areas of the teaching and supervision of reading. Nine classes were observed in each school for a total number of 108 observations. First, third, and fifth grade reading classes were visited. Some classes were visited by only one of the two observers; some were visited by both. The observers used a checklist entitled Observer Guide-Reading.[2] The observation was followed by a 10 minute private interview with the individual in overall charge of reading instruction.

The Observer Guide-Reading consists of 13 topics, each of which is evaluated on a five point rating scale from "low" to "high". Descriptions of "low" and "high" practices are included for each topic. If any of the comments in the paragraph labeled "low" described the class being observed, this category was checked by the observer. However, a class had to meet all of the "high" specifications to be classified in that category. Schools which meet some but not all of the superior classifications were rated 2, 3, or 4.

---

[2] Twelve of the 13 criteria for the investigation were derived from those used in a study by Sawyer and Taylor in the Journal of Reading, March 1968. Jane Algozzine, Chief, Bureau of Reading Education, New York State Education Department, prepared the operational descriptions for the "high" and "low" categories and was responsible for the development of the complete instrument.

Practices in the "low" category ranged from undesirable to intolerable. A practice in the "high" category was considered ideal and relatively few classes met these criteria. The observers were encouraged to list their specific recommendations and/or observations in the section provided for comments.

In order to determine whether or not Type A and Type B schools have significant differences in the observable conduct of their reading programs, a chi-square analysis was performed using 2 x 3 contingency tables. Cell frequencies were increased by combining responses 1 and 2 and responses 4 and 5. All responses classified as "other" were arbitrarily assigned to response category 3.

Table 3.3 represents a complete summary of the 13 areas measured by the Observer Guide-Reading. The areas in which the A type schools scored significantly higher were:

(1) Presence of Appropriate Materials $p < .01$
(2) Effective Use of Materials and $p < .01$
(7) Application of Reading Skills $p < .05$

Areas significant at $p < .10$ were:

(3) Demonstration of Understanding the Process of Teaching Reading
(4) Provision of a Balanced Program of Instruction
(11) Skill in Diagnosis
(12) Encouragement of Free Reading

These are discussed in the order of their significance rather than their order of appearance on the instrument.

Although category 1, "Presence of Appropriate Materials" and category 2, "Effective Use of Materials" seem logically dependent, in the sense that if the materials were not being used effectively, then they were judged as inappropriate, there were clear differences in the ratings of the observers. The significant variance for category 1 was not in the high ratings. In fact, nearly 50 percent of the ratings for both A and B schools were high. The significant chi-square resulted from the difference in the low and average ratings. Type A schools had significantly fewer low ratings

TABLE 3.3

Observer-Guide Reading Response Frequencies for Type A and Type B Schools and Chi-squares for 2 x 3 Contingency Tables

Cat. No.	Category Description	School Type	Low (1, 2)	Average (3,Other)	High (4, 5)	x^2
1	Presence of Appropriate Materials	A	5	27	33	
		B	19	19	32	9.40***
2	Effective Use of Materials by Teachers	A	11	27	27	
		B	29	24	17	10.38***
3	Demonstration of the Effective Use of the Process of Teaching Reading	A	13	21	31	
		B	26	20	23	5.43*
4	Provision of a Balanced Program of Instruction	A	8	30	27	
		B	20	29	21	5.73*
5	Emphasis on Literal Comprehension and Critical Thought Processing	A	9	23	31	
		B	16	31	23	3.61
6	Guidance in Purposeful Reading	A	13	30	22	
		B	23	28	19	2.89
7	Application of Reading Skills	A	8	35	22	
		B	20	35	15	6.29**
8	Relation of Reading Content to Experience	A	14	29	22	
		B	25	27	18	3.39
9	Attention to Individual Differences Beyond Differentiation of Materials	A	24	23	18	
		B	34	17	19	2.47
10	Effective Use of Grouping	A	25	19	21	
		B	32	24	14	2.66
11	Skill in Diagnosis	A	18	36	11	
		B	32	28	10	4.79*
12	Encouragement of Free Reading	A	8	32	25	
		B	19	26	25	4.92*
13	Teacher Personality	A	4	23	38	
		B	12	20	38	4.03

*** $x^2 > 9.2$ $p < .01$
** $x^2 > 5.99$ $p < .05$
* $x^2 > 4.6$ $p < .10$

than did Type B schools. In case of Category 2, A and B schools differed in the frequency of low and high ratings and both types received approximately the same number of average ratings.

Although the complete instrument is found in Appendix A, descriptions of low and high ratings, as they appear on the rating instrument, Observer Guide-Reading, are repeated in connection with the discussion for the convenience of the reader for areas of significant differences.

1. Presence of Appropriate Materials ($p < .01$).

LOW	HIGH
The only instructional materials available are basal readers on a very narrow range of reading levels. Charts and materials for displays are not accessible in the classroom. Supplementary workbooks or drill materials for reinforcing skills are not supplied.	A wide variety of materials which reflect the range of instructional levels within the classroom are available or may be obtained upon demand from the reading materials collection. Charts and other supplementary materials are readily accessible. At each level, there are sufficient materials to enable a child to repeat the level without reusing a material, until mastery of vocabulary and skills is achieved. A vertical range permits children to move to new levels without waiting for others in his group.

2. Effective Use of Materials ($p < .01$)

LOW	HIGH
Materials are distributed with little regard to the appropriateness of their use. Little attention is given to the use of charts or teacher or student-made materials. The same drill in the same quantity is given to all children in a group. There is no differentiation in assignments or adaptation of materials to meet varying reading needs.	Instructional materials are assigned to meet individual needs and levels. Supplementary or illustrative materials are frequently integrated with the lesson. A variety of materials are used creatively in the classroom.

All schools had a broad variety of instructional materials in reading, among which were included basal readers, experience charts, SRA materials, phonics books, multilevel skills materials, supplementary trade books, and urban readers. Where materials were lacking, perhaps the teacher was unfamiliar with the materials available, since a wealth of materials was observed in other rooms within the same school. It is possible that the ratings for this category were influenced more by appropriateness than mere "presence."

Comments made in the observer reports such as: "The teacher was using a special Consonant Chart which was completely divorced from the lesson she later developed" indicate the contamination of Category 1 ratings by Category 2 considerations. It is difficult even for an expert, to rate quantity and variety of materials without considering the appropriateness, quality, and effective usage.

The more frequent use of the extremes (high, low) on the rating scale for Category 2, "Effective Use of Materials," suggests that since the behavior was easier to judge by reading experts, fuller use was made of the rating scale. Whenever discriminations were difficult, there seemed to be a tendency by observers to score toward the middle of the scale, i.e., the average. The significant chi-square ($p < .01$) for the category carries the implication that teachers in Type A schools made more effective use of available materials. This is an important finding.

The third category in which A schools differed significantly from B schools was number 7, "Application of Reading Skills." The description

of high and low ratings are given below:

7. Application of Reading Skills ($p. < .05$)

LOW	HIGH
The practices employed in guiding reading during reading lessons are not evident in other subjects, such as social studies or science. Vocabulary and concepts are not developed. Great dependence is placed on "round-robin" oral reading as a means of covering textual materials.	Lessons in other subjects which involve reading of textual or reference materials are developed as directed reading activities. Vocabulary study, concept development, purposeful questions which necessitate the application of reading skills to textual materials are part of the lesson. Where necessary additional direct instruction in reading skills related to content materials is provided.

Higher achieving schools were rated as average and better than average in applying reading skills to other content areas. Lower achieving schools seemed more dependent on round-robin reading with inadequate application of skills to the content material.

The three most significant categories, taken together imply that in the higher achieving Type A schools: (1) a wide variety of materials was observed, (2) teachers made the most effective use of their materials, and (3) reading skills were reinforced through teaching in other areas such as social studies and science.

The categories for which chi-square was significant at $p < .10$ are all related to factors essential to a good reading program, i.e., the observers rated teachers in Type A schools higher on their understanding of the process of teaching instruction, provision of a balanced program of instruction, skill in diagnosis, and encouragement of free reading (categories 3, 4, 11, and 12).

Further examination of table 3.3 shows that the significant chi-squares on the Observer Reading Guide are primarily due to differences in frequencies in the "low" category, with the B schools contributing greater numbers of "low" tallies.

3. Demonstration of the Effective Use of the Process of Teaching Reading ($p < .10$)

LOW	HIGH
There is little evidence of lesson structure beyond that given in a commercially planned teacher manual or guide. The lesson seems unrelated to the needs of the students and does not make use of all available materials and resources. A lack of knowledge of fundamental structure of the language and of phonetic and structural generalizations which are useful in reading is evident. Inaccurate examples are frequently used. No systematic method exists by which the teacher attempts to organize lessons in a flexible manner to meet the needs of individual students.	The lesson, even when modeled on that in a teacher's guide, has been adapted or supplemented to fit varying student needs. Accurate use is made in the instruction of the generalizations about language which determine pronunciation, syntax and meaning. Intervention is made when needed and steps are taken to lead children to correct responses, if necessary. Performance is evaluated through standardized and informal tests. Conferences are conducted when necessary with supporting personnel such as guidance counselors and social workers.

The observers concluded that many teachers in Type B schools seemed unfamiliar with the processes of teaching reading. They failed to understand the sequence of subskills involved in unlocking words. They were aware of general techniques for organizing a reading lesson but failed to relate decoding skills to comprehension goals. Skills lessons were frequently irrelevant to children's needs.

The following selected comments accompanied poor ratings:

"A typical whole class basal reader lesson. Children reading below grade and were using a second grade reader. The teacher had little understanding of reading process and when asked to describe what happens over a weekly period said, "just this."

"The teachers apparently are not aware that the skills can be broken down to finer levels than vocabulary, comprehension and phonics."

"Unrelated aspects of vocabulary and phonics drills preceded silent reading."

"She uses the Manual and that poorly, and just keeps on going whether her program is effective or not."

From among the schools meeting the criteria for ethnic distribution and from free lunch eligibility, schools were paired so that the two were matched on the socioeconomic indices, but differed in that one school had a record of higher achievement in reading compared to the other.

However, all of the schools in the study were below the 34th percentile on the New York State Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) Test.[1] Consequently, the findings of this study should be interpreted cautiously and apply only to schools with disadvantaged, predominantly Negro student populations in ghetto neighborhoods with poor reading levels.

Table 1.1 summarizes the ethnic composition, socioeconomic indices, and grade means by school on the Metropolitan Reading Test for grades 2, 3, and 4.

Table 1.2 contains the mean of grade means, variance and significance test (t) for the Metropolitan Reading Test for higher versus lower achieving schools for grades 2, 3, and 4.

The results reported in table 1.2 verify that the two groups of schools were significantly different in group reading means on the Metropolitan Reading Test. Despite reversal at the third grade in the two pairs of schools, viz., pairs one and three, the results were consistent for two administrations of the test.

---

[1] The Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP), established in the fall of 1965, is a statewide testing program which provides teachers, schools, and the State Education Department with an annual inventory of pupil achievement in arithmetic and reading in grades 1, 3, 6, and 9. The tests used in the program are tests of achievement based on New York State courses of study. The tests are administered at the beginning of each school year to pupils in every school in New York State.

Table 1.1

Comparison of Pairs of Schools
Matched on Socioeconomic Criteria with
Differing Reading Achievement

School Code[1]	ETHNIC COMPOSITION				METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT					
					GRADE 2		GRADE 3		GRADE 4	
	% Puerto R.	% Negro	% Other	Free Lunch	Oct. 1966	April 1967	Oct. 1966	April 1967	Oct. 1966	April 1967
A_1	16.1	75.8	8.0	61	1.9	2.9	2.8	2.2	4.2	4.9
B_1	26.9	72.0	1.0	94	1.6	2.2	3.5	3.0	2.9	3.5
A_2	38.3	27.8	33.7	65	2.0	3.5	2.6	3.8	3.7	4.7
B_2	23.4	43.1	33.3	65	1.9	1.8	2.6	3.5	3.4	4.1
A_3	61.2	33.2	5.5	50	1.7	2.6	2.3	2.2	3.0	2.9
B_3	65.8	31.4	2.7	76	1.6	2.1	3.1	2.8	3.6	3.2
A_4	5.1	91.4	3.4	58	1.9	2.7	2.5	3.3	3.7	4.6
B_4	1.1	97.7	1.1	64	1.7	2.4	2.3	3.3	3.2	4.0
A_5	22.8	75.1	1.3	67	1.7	2.5	2.3	3.5	3.0	4.0
B_5	25.9	72.1	1.8	32	1.6	2.2	2.3	3.0	3.0	3.5
A_6	0.4	96.2	3.3	29	2.0	3.1	2.8	3.9	3.9	4.8
B_6	3.3	96.2	0.4	47	1.7	2.4	2.5	3.4	3.4	4.1

[1]School A denotes the higher achieving school. The subscript denotes the pair number.

achievement. This attitude of resignation was typified by comments which implied nothing more could be done to enhance achievement and that students were performing optimally. The principals in lower achieving schools felt their staffs were teaching well, but that the students still failed to learn. Low achievement was frequently attributed to factors extrinsic to the school and related to the socioeconomic status of the student, such as disinterested parents, low moral standards, and cultural deprivation. On occasion, subtle references were made to the possibility of genetically inferior intelligence.

Lower achieving schools more typically functioned in the authoritarian atmosphere. Although lip service was paid to delegating responsibility and authority to the faculty, decision making rested with the principal. In general, the principals had a paternalistic attitude toward staff, pupils, and community. Observers were left with the impression that the administrators felt they knew best what the students needed, since they had many years of experience in comparable neighborhoods.

Little staff cooperation was observed. No concern with staff development activities was evidenced. Channels of communication were indistinct and often nonexistent. Consequently, instructional planning was limited or ineffectual. The resultant academic programs lacked flexibility and focused upon little else other than subject matter. No provisions were made for innovations or experimentation. Staff members readily accepted a centrally developed curriculum and made little effort to adapt curriculum for local needs. A related problem concerned the lack of planning for student activities which evolve from the needs and interests of pupils.

Comparatively little effort was devoted to individualize instruction. Consequently, total group instruction predominated and each individual in

a class tended to be in the same book on the same page at the same time. Seating patterns were standard with movable furniture made immovable by choice. Instruction was teacher dominated with passive involvement by pupils. Classrooms tended to be cluttered, crowded, and frequently available materials and text books were outdated and worn. Limited use was made of available instructional aids, such as audiovisual materials.

Community involvement was either nonexistent or ineffectively organized. Access to schools was limited and communication among the professional staff and parents was restricted. Little interest was evidenced in attempts to reshape attitudes or improve relationships. Principals spoke of the inevitability of the difficulties with which they were confronted and seemed to feel that nothing could change the pupils, teachers, parents, or community.

Generally the climate in low achieving schools tended to be defeatist and negative. Principals seemed involved in rules, regulations, and routines rather than the individual student. The instructional atmosphere was rigid and authoritarian. In short, educational leadership was unimaginative and traditional.

Characteristics of Higher Achieving Schools--Higher achieving schools tended to have less disruptive environments, better student control, and brighter, more attractive buildings and classrooms. School lunch programs were adequate and well-planned, while these services were more poorly organized in lower achieving schools.

Although classroom teaching processes were classified as traditional in both categories of schools, instruction in higher achieving schools was more imaginative and varied. For example, seating arrangements were more flexible and pupils participated more actively in learning situations. Teachers seemed to make more effective use of varied materials and

As table 2.5 indicates, the weighted mean for the relatively higher achieving schools combined was virtually equivalent to the weighted mean for the relatively lower achieving schools. The differences between the two means is not statistically significant. It represented only 1.5 percent of the length of the sociometric scale applied. The observed absence of a statistically significant association between level of school achievement and quality of social climate, as measured, in the 12 paired schools is supported by the fact that the slight differences that were observed between the means of the two schools in each pair did not consistently fall in any one direction. That is to say, in three of the pairs the lower achieving schools evidenced the higher mean values, while in the three remaining pairs the higher achieving schools did. No tendency or trend for peer ratings in the higher achieving group to have higher mean values than peer ratings in lower achieving group was in evidence.

Consequently, no meaningful difference between the quality of peer relations in higher achieving schools and lower achieving schools was observed. A similar climate appeared to exist in both groups. The hypothesis that the school differences in reading achievement may be explained, in part, by differences in pupil social climate is rejected by these data.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF THE READING PROGRAM

This chapter of the report contains the analysis, discussion, and conclusions based on data gathered from classroom teachers using the instrument, Appraising Growth in Reading, and from the observations of trained reading supervisors recorded on the instrument, Observer Guide-Reading. Copies of these instruments are found respectively in Appendixes A and B.

Appraising Growth in Reading

The instrument Appraising Growth in Reading is an adaptation of a system of observation initially developed by Lorne H. Woollatt for the Baltimore Public Schools. It is designed to evaluate the reading program along the following nine dimensions:

1. Experiential Reading
2. Comprehension in Silent Reading
3. Facility in Oral Reading
4. Vocabulary Development
5. Use of Books
6. Teaching Method
7. Pupil Growth
8. Teacher Characteristics
9. Environment

The instrument is an evaluative checklist. Teachers rate their reading program on each of the 46 items comprising the nine categories using a scale of "emphasis" graduated as follows: no (2), little (3), moderate (4), heavy (5) emphasis. A code of (1) was used if the category was not applicable. A total of 108 teachers completed the instruments:

Comments accompanying good or high ratings:

"Cumulative folders indicate child's placement at each level. These are started with careful evaluation in grade 1."

"Teacher very much aware of children's needs - discussed achievement and problems of individual children and measures taken to help them."

"The teacher gave an Open Textbook test at the beginning and formed two groups - one above reading level and the other below." Says groups have changed and many in slowest group are doing much better and sometimes read with the others."

"First grade coordinator tests every two months with a 'standardized' word test. Class regrouped. Teacher also gives test."

Comments accompanying poor ratings:

"Uses citywide reading tests. Uses Weekly Reader tests just for fun because children enjoy them. Uses skills tests (finding general idea) to discover comprehension needs."

"Teacher 'can tell by knowing what they do in class'."

"No diagnostic tests by teacher or supervisors. No evidence in class."

"Uses N.Y.S. test results. Uses workbook work and oral reading."

"Test results are used for placement (homogeneous grouping)."

"Uses News Trails tests. Informal inventory in the open books at beginning of the year."

"This teacher believes phonics is the answer to all reading problems."

In many lessons, teachers were overconcerned with literal factual response to the materials read. This pattern appeared in both lower and higher achieving schools. Some teachers, however, did stimulate critical thinking and personalized reactions by skillful questioning. There was little difference in the guidance for reading in the higher and lower achieving schools. Most teachers failed to provide meaningful learning for the lessons observed. They did set aims, occasionally put them on the chalkboard or stated them as overall questions. These activities lacked motivational effect and relevancy for the most part.

Higher achieving schools were rated as average and better than average in applying reading skills to other content areas. Lower achieving schools

seemed more dependent on round-robin reading with inadequate application of skills to the content material.

Materials selected for instructional purposes in higher achieving schools were more closely related to the ethnic and cultural background of the children concerned, than the materials used in the other schools. In Group A schools the teacher either used such materials or was able to relate the materials at hand to the real life experiences of the children. In Group A schools observers rated use of materials as average or better than average. In Group B schools use of materials was rated from low to average; there was greater dependence on basal readers and more rigid adherence to instructional manuals.

A majority of the ratings of teacher personality were at the upper levels. There was little difference between groups of schools as to the percentage of teachers with undesirable personality traits. Most teachers were described as responsive, sensitive, and deeply concerned with their children. Sone newer teachers tended to be overwhelmed by the complexity of reading instruction.

In both Type A and Type B schools there was a notable absence of attention to individual differences, of effective sub-grouping, and of diagnoses in a majority of classes observed. Teachers tended to depend on subjective evaluations based on informal observations in grouping children and in selecting purposes for instruction. They accepted city-wide test results without analyzing the specific implications for specific children. Their justification for the whole class instruction was the alleged homogeneity of their groups. Yet in these classes the observers discerned a considerable range of ability and skill needs

which were poorly served. Comments by observers indicated that most classroom teachers were unaware of the use of diagnostic techniques in the teaching of reading. As a result of this lack of knowledge of teachers, many children are working at frustration level in unsuitable materials. It is, of course, impossible to individualize instruction where diagnosis has not identified specific needs. Neither homogeneous class groupings nor reduced class size should be permitted to substitute for flexible subgrouping with differentiated instruction based on specific diagnosed needs.

CHAPTER IV

Summary and Conclusions

Opportunities for urban disadvantaged children are closely related to successful school achievement. The problems associated with their education have been widely discussed; the area of reading comprehensions has been of particular concern. Educators have devoted greater effort to proving that differences in reading achievement exist, than to developing programs which would alleviate the problem. Comparatively few specific instructional techniques have been designed for the urban disadvantaged, despite efforts to improve their education. This study attempted to answer the question: What were the methods and procedures used in exceptional schools in deprived areas which produced unexpectedly good results in citywide reading tests?

Research Design

During the 1967-68 school year, supervisory and research personnel from the New York State Education Department and the New York City Public Schools participated in a pilot study designed to examine educational practices in segregated schools. Two groups of schools each consisting of six elementary schools, were identified. At the third grade level, Group A schools had achieved significantly higher mean reading scores than Group B schools in the New York State Pupil Evaluation Program, although both groups were below average in achievement. The schools were comparable in size, level of segregation and socioeconomic status of the student bodies. Both groups of schools were between 900 and 1200 enrollment, more than 90 percent nonwhite and their student bodies were of lower socio-economic status.

In order to account for the differences in reading achievement between

the matched groups, the two groups of schools were compared on a variety of measures which included: results of interviews with the elementary principals and the school community coordinators, sociometric data gathered on the Ohio Social Acceptance Scale, results of a teacher questionnaire Appraising Growth in Reading, and results of classroom observation by teams of reading supervisors from the staffs of the New York State Education Department and the New York City Board of Education using the Observer Guide, an instrument designed to obtain objective ratings of qualitative variations in classroom reading programs. Copies of the instruments used in the study are found in Appendixes A-I.

Methods and Procedures of the Reading Program

Ratings of various aspects of the reading programs were made independently by teachers in the schools studied and by teams of reading specialists. Group comparisons of higher achieving (Group A) and lower achieving (Group B) schools were made to determine difference in methods and procedures between the two types of schools.

Observers using the Observer Guide-Reading found some differences between reading programs in Group A and Group B schools. Group A schools were rated significantly higher in only three of 13 categories (a) Presence of Appropriate Materials, (b) Effective Use of Materials by Teachers, and (c) Application of Reading Skills. However, in no instance were Group B schools rated significantly higher than Group A schools. Analysis of the response frequencies reveals that the major differences occur in the "High" and "Low" categories of the items rated. There was a definite tendency of observers to place more Type B schools in the Low category and more Type A schools in the High category for all 13 items although such differences resulted in only three cases of statistical significance beyond the 5 percent level.

More definitive results were obtained from the teachers' ratings on Appraising Growth in Reading. Teachers in Group A schools gave their reading programs significantly higher ratings than did teachers in Group B schools on each of nine program dimensions.

Caution is advised in attempting to draw conclusions based on comparative analysis of the different scales used for collecting observers' ratings and teachers' ratings. The scales do not measure the same dimensions. Therefore, it is not possible to determine agreement of observers and teachers on ratings of specific program areas. However, if each instrument is regarded as a valid measure for rating the methods and procedures of the reading program as a whole, the results are definitely in favor of the "A" schools. Dimensions showing the greatest advantage for the A schools based on observer ratings are related to the availability and effective use of materials and the application of reading skills in other subject areas. Dimensions showing the greatest advantage for the A schools based on teacher ratings are Experiential Reading, Environment, and Teacher Characteristics.

Since the instruments used do not yield a total score for reading programs, the findings above must be subjectively synthesized for interpretation. The six dimensions identified by the two rating scales as showing the greatest differences between Group A and Group B schools indicate that school environment (including instructional materials) and the utilization of reading skills (including experiential reading in other curriculum areas) are more important than the specific teaching method used in teaching reading to disadvantaged students.

A distinction must be made when interpreting these findings between quantitative and qualitative differences. In some categories, schools in both groups were subject to severe criticism by the observers. They

reported, for instance, that some good lessons were observed in the B schools and some poor lessons in the A schools. In any event covered by the instruments, the within school differences were greater than the between school differences. When the data for schools was combined into groups of schools, the differences between the groups were not significant. The failure to find significant differences does not detract from the importance of the study, since the instruments provided for a general evaluation of ongoing reading programs in racially segregated, disadvantaged schools. Most of the findings apply equally to both groups of schools in the study and generalize to similar schools.

General Educational Program Developed under the Leadership of the Principal

Results of interviews and on-site observations by elementary supervisors have been discussed at length in Chapter II. Characteristics of Group A and Group B schools were described, and some interpretation has been given.

It is difficult to partial out the specific influence a principal has on the instructional program of his school. Past influences on the school must be considered. School and community problems are seldom formulated in relation to the personality of a single individual, particularly in a large system such as New York City. Consequently, the historical aspects of a school and a community should be carefully examined when a program is evaluated.

Differences between the two groups of schools were not distinct in all cases. In some cases a lower achieving school was rated superior when compared to a higher achieving school. For example, a lower achieving school scored higher in planning and scheduling because curtailed sessions permitted more teachers to be available for conferences. Another

Group B school received a high rating in physical surroundings because the school was newer and more modern. A higher achieving school was given a low rating in guidance services because of a lack of staff and excessive administrative structuring of the programs.

Schools in both categories received poor ratings in several areas. In all schools, cooperative teacher planning was limited and many students seemed passive and disinterested. Science teaching was poor and audiovisual materials were used infrequently, as well as ineffectively. Several higher achieving schools used rigid seating patterns and emphasized a direct single-focus instructional approach with no attempt at developing smaller subgroups within the classroom. Instruction, even in higher achieving schools, was frequently teacher centered with little student involvement.

Factors common to many districts but somewhat more extreme in the New York City Schools present administrators with a difficult task. Centralized control by the Board of Education, a rigid and comprehensive union contract, large enrollments, a transient student population, high teacher turnover, and deeply rooted and varied student problems are serious difficulties which exist in schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged students.

Observers were able to identify some differences, however, in administrative factors relating to the principals of the two types of schools in the study. Although principals of both Group A and Group B schools tended to be authoritarian, those in Group A were more likely to offer flexible leadership and to show interest in innovation. Principals in Group B schools were more likely to be resigned to the status quo. Principals of Group A schools were more devoted to the welfare of the staff and students, whereas those in Group B were generally concerned with rules, regulations, and routines, resulting in unimaginative leadership. Principals of Group A

schools were more likely to have a program of continuous evaluation with feedback of test results and other pertinent information to teachers. Channels of communication in Group B schools were indistinct resulting in limited planning activities.

Differenoes in instructional methods and environment were also noted by interviewers. Although all schools in the study used traditional teaching processes, Group A schools tended to be more imaginative--seating arrangements were more flexible; there was more pupil participation; more effective use was made of available materials; team teaching was used for more individualized instruction; library programs were more active. Group A schools generally had a less disruptive environment, better student control, and brighter, more attractive buildings and classrooms.

Interviews discovered differences in community and parental involvement with school activities. In Group B schools, community involvement was nonexistant or ineffectively organized. Access to the school was limited and communication among professional staff and parents restricted. On the other hand, in Group A schools parental involvement was positive and directed toward specific achievement goals. Parents exhibited a cooperative attitude and traditional middle class values and were more intimately involved with staff in discussing the school program.

Community Conditions and School-Community Relations

Results of interviews with school community coordinators yielded inconsistent patterns when analyzed by paired schools. Community conditions, as measured by Quality of Housing and General Living Conditions, were sometimes rated higher for the Group A school and sometimes for the Group B school for given pairs of schools. In some cases, no differences could be discerned. Although Group A schools have an edge in favorable comparisons for these two dimensions, it is impossible to build a strong case for

concluding that community conditions are better for Type A schools than for Type B schools.

School-community relations were measured by four items: (a) Extent of Parent Participation, (b) School Efforts to Secure Cooperation, (c) Parental Image of the School, and (d) Support by Community Organization. Although fluctuations occur from one pair of schools to another, Group A schools enjoy an advantage in favorable comparisons. Group A schools rate much higher on all dimensions except Extent of Parent Participation.

Although the pairs of schools were matched on the basis of ethnic composition and percent of low income pupils, this matching did not result in closely similar pairs of schools. For the most part, exact matching is not possible.

Some of the difficulty stems from a prevalent misconception, one which was recognized when the study was designed. It is often assumed that a school which is predominantly Negro is also educationally disadvantaged. However, there are in some schools significant numbers of middle class Negro families who do not have the disadvantages customarily associated with ghetto schools.

School A_1 of the high-achieving group is a prime example. Although this school has a pupil population of 76 percent Negro, 16 percent Puerto Rican, and 8 percent other and has 61 percent of the pupils on low income status, there is nevertheless a considerable number of pupils from middle class families. The sociometric status of School A_1 is clearly superior to that of School B_1, and in this respect, the schools are not closely matched. It is literally not possible to find in New York City a school which matched School A_1 and had significantly low reading scores on the citywide tests.

The implied question which underlies the whole study, "Why does this

4. Provision of a Balanced Program of Instruction ($p < .10$)

LOW	HIGH
Little effort is made to provide opportunities for extension of reading into other language arts areas such as speech, literature or writing. One skill area is emphasized to the exclusion of others; e.g., phonetic word attack. The classroom program provides no opportunity for the development of individual interests in other kinds of reading activity.	The program in reading provides direction in all skills areas in proportion of immediate instructional needs. Enrichment is provided and reading interests are extended into other language arts. Although a basal reader may be the foundation, opportunities are provided for many other kinds of reading oriented activities, such as research, dramatization and written and oral creative expression.

The observers reported that a balanced program of reading instruction was more often discerned in Type B schools. In the upper grades, many reading lessons centered on materials from curriculum areas, such as science and social studies. In lower grades, experience charts reviewed trips, experiments, and classroom happenings.

Some selected comments made by observers which accompanied high ratings were:

"phonics, free reading, experience charts, much stimulation of oral language. Homework rexographed four times a week signed by parent."

"Opportunities are provided for furthering comprehension skills and for dramatization. The children love to act. Each child has a reading notebook in addition to the reader and workbook."

"The teacher described other types of reading activities - original stories, social studies, children's newspapers, etc., and there were several experience charts in evidence."

Comments by observers, such as the following, typically accompanied low ratings on this item.

"There was over-emphasis on the skills (for the sake of the skill) rather than application of the skills through reading."

"Teacher says they work at reading practically all day long. The outward signs - aim, words, silent reading, etc., are there but teacher does not seem to understand the purpose. Is following manual blindly."

"As one objective of the lesson was reading to find answers to specific questions the answer might have been read from the book."

12. Encouragement of Free Reading ($p < .10$)

LOW	HIGH
No books for independent or leisure reading are available in the classroom. No effort is made to encourage reading through displays, rewards or provision of time for such reading. Reading stories to children for enjoyment or using the library are not encouraged.	Interesting books and information about books are displayed in the classrooms. Children are encouraged to join book clubs, talk about books and take advantage of library facilities. Time during the school day is provided for teachers, librarians or aides to read to children and for children to read books of their own choice.

The observers reported that a majority of teachers in the schools observed were encouraging free reading of self-selected materials. A few teachers, generally in the B schools, were reluctant to use class time for what they erroneously assumed to be a frivolous objective.

11. Skill in Diagnosis ($p < .10$)

LOW	HIGH
There is little evidence of the effective use of standardized or informal test results to determine a child's reading status. No use is made of oral reading inventories to confirm that materials given a child are within his instructional or independent reading levels.	Data from both standardized and informal reading scales are used in determining individual instructional programs. Informal oral and silent reading inventories are repeated periodically to make sure the materials given and the group placement of each child are appropriate. During the class period observations which indicate particular needs or progress in reading of an individual student are noted.

Nearly twice as many teachers in Type B schools received low ratings on this item than in Type A schools. The following comments made by observers on the instrument indicates the positive and negative aspects of the methods and use of diagnosis by the teachers.

largely Negro school obtain reading scores higher than the scores obtained in most Negro schools?" has therefore a partial answer: "Because this school is unusual in that it has a large number of middle class Negro pupils."

The main finding of the interviews of the school-community coordinators is that with the exception of the School A_1 - School B_1 pair, there is little difference in the general character of the community for the higher achieving schools as compared to the lower achieving schools. This is true of those adverse social factors associated with the ghetto.

The important educational factor which was revealed by the interviewers was the crucial influence of the school principal. In every case, except for School A_1, the higher achieving school had, in the opinion of the School-Community Coordinator, a more dedicated principal who worked actively with the community and had an active and driving commitment to pupil achievement.

Peer-Pupil Relationships in the School

Reported findings are based on the analysis of the sociometric data obtained from a systematically selected 50 percent sample of the fifth grade pupils participating in the study. The sociometric characteristics of the schools selected for study were surveyed by a Class Sociometric Questionnaire, a refinement and extension of the widely used Ohio Social Acceptance Scale.

Every pupil selected was asked to rate all of the other members of his class, and the total of these were analyzed using a Krushal-Wallis, one-way nonparametric analysis of variance based on rankings. The weighted mean for the higher achieving schools combined was practically equal to the weighted mean for the lower achieving schools. The difference between the two means is not statistically significant. No tendency or trend for peer ratings in the higher achieving schools to have higher mean values than in the lower achieving schools was in evidence.

2

Both Type A and B schools appeared to be similar in peer ratings.

Organizational Climate of the Schools

Pair comparisons on the Organizational Climate Index yielded results which were not readily interpretable because mean scale differences between pairs of schools varied in direction. Therefore, group comparisons were made to determine differences by type of school. As a result of these comparisons, Group A schools scored significantly lower on two first order factors: Supportiveness and Orderliness. No differences were found for Intellectual Climate, Achievement Standards, Practicalness, or Impulse Control.

From the above results, it is concluded that some differences in organizational climate exist between the higher achieving and lower achieving disadvantaged schools studied. Teachers in the higher achieving schools apparently have more autonomy or fewer dependency needs requiring administrative support. Organizational structure may tend to be more informal within higher achieving schools, and administration less authoritarian. These findings corroborate the results of interviews and observations discussed under General Educational Program Developed Under the Leadership of the Principal.

Seemingly inconsistent with the above results, Group A schools scored significantly lower on the second order factor Development Press, and no significant difference was found between the A and B schools on Control Press. However, this may be interpreted as indicating less need for support as reward for self-actualizing behavior on the part of teachers in Group A schools.

Implications

The present study, designed as a pilot study to examine educational practices in disadvantaged schools, should be regarded only as exploratory in the area of reading research in disadvantaged schools. No specific recommendations relating to practice, other than what is generally regarded as good practice, can be made on the basis of this study because of a number of limitations. This section will thus consider the implications of the study for conducting improved research on the reading process.

1. Future research should focus on the instruments used to observe the reading program; further development and refinement in much greater detail is needed. The instruments used to observe the reading program in the present study appear to be workable and meaningful in the public school context, but their utility in the scientific sense remains to be established.

2. There is a need for the use of more precise measures of socioeconomic status as well as more detailed analyses of achievement differences. Future studies should identify the specific instructional objectives of the reading program so that more specific evaluative criteria can be used for judging the effects of instruction. The New York State Pupil Evaluation Program tests and other standardized tests allow only gross judgments with limited decision making utility for revision of the instructional process. A time series or longitudinal type of evaluation, based on specific behavioral goals, such as the Comprehensive Achievement Monitoring System (CAM), would allow more comprehensive test results directly related to observation. For example, using this procedure the total reading score could be broken down into several elements and related to observations of variations in teaching reading with known relevance to the criterion used for evaluation.

3. In future studies the sampling of schools must be improved so that studies of higher achieving schools contain individual schools which are all higher in achievement than the individual members of the lower achieving schools while both groups can be otherwise equated.

4. Further studies of this nature should include more than one observation on each of a few classrooms in individual schools; several observations on each class in each unit should be made at different points in time in order to obtain more reliable judgments. More direct observation

should be used in the school to observe teachers' and principals' activities which impinge on the reading program such as conferences, planning meetings, teacher-team work, and the testing program. More direct observation rather than the interview technique should be used in the study of the community also.

5. Student attitudes and factors of family background which contribute more strongly to achievement than any other known factors should be sampled directly in future studies. Teacher characteristics and the educational preparation of teachers with particular study of their educational activities related to the teaching of reading should be a major part of any new research.

Future studies of this type, therefore, should use a more complete model for the research as well as methods which will result in more comprehensive data in order to arrive at useful recommendations. The results of the present study, however, include much in the way of new developments for observing and evaluating the reading process. It remains for future studies to improve upon these efforts and thus generate the information useful in decision making.

Appendix A

FACTORS OF EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS

OBSERVER GUIDE - READING

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Division of Research and Bureau of Reading Education

March 1968

SUMMARY PROFILE

Teacher _____
(last) (first)

School _____ Date _____
mo. day year

Observer _____
(last) (first)

CATEOGRY	1 Low	2	3 Average	4	5 High
1. Presence of Appropriate Materials	___	___	___	___	___
2. Effective Use of Materials	___	___	___	___	___
3. Demonstration of Understanding the Process of Teaching Reading	___	___	___	___	___
4. Provision of a Balanced Program of Instruction	___	___	___	___	___
5. Literal Comprehension and Critical Thought Processes	___	___	___	___	___
6. Guidance in Purposeful Reading	___	___	___	___	___
7. Application of Reading Skills	___	___	___	___	___
8. Relation of Reading Content to Experience	___	___	___	___	___
9. Attention to Individual Differences Beyond Differentiation of Materials	___	___	___	___	___
10. Effective Use of Grouping	___	___	___	___	___
11. Skill in Diagnosis	___	___	___	___	___
12. Encouragement of Free Reading	___	___	___	___	___
13. Teacher Personality	___	___	___	___	___
Evaluation of Total Lesson	___	___	___	___	___

INSTRUCTIONS

The "Observer Guide - Reading" consists of 13 categories, each of which is evaluated on a five point rating scale from "low" to "high." Paragraphs describing "low" and "high" practices are included for each topic. Practices in the "low" category range from undesirable to intolerable. If any of the comments in the paragraph labeled "low" describe the class being observed, category 1 should be checked. However, a class must meet most of the "high" specifications to be classified in category 5. A practice in the "high" category should be considered ideal with relatively few classes meeting these criteria. Schools which meet some but not all of the superior classifications should be rated 2, 3, or 4.

If the observer is not able to evaluate a category after the observation, or wishes to gather supplementary date, a brief teacher has been scheduled.

The observer can list specific recommendations or observations in the section provided for comments. After the individual topics have been completed, the ratings should be listed on the "Summary Profile" and an evaluation of the total lesson should be made.

Some of the criteria selected for the investigation were derived from those used in a study by Rita Sawyer and Lucille B. Taylor in the Journal of Reading, March 1968.

1. Presence of Appropriate Materials

LOW	HIGH
The only instructional materials available are basal readers on a very narrow range of reading levels. Charts and materials for displays are not accessible in the classroom. Supplementary workbooks or drill materials for reinforcing skills are not supplied.	A wide variety of materials which reflect the range of instructional levels within the classroom are available or may be obtained upon demand from the reading materials collection. Charts and other supplementary materials are readily accessible. At each level there are sufficient materials to enable a child to repeat the level without reusing a material, until mastery of vocabulary and skills is achieved. A vertical range permits children to move to new levels without waiting for others in his group.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

2. Effective Use of Materials

LOW	HIGH
Materials are distributed with little regard to the appropriateness of their use. Little attention is given to the use of charts or teacher or student-made materials. The same drills in the same quantity are given to all children in a group. There is no differentiation in assignments or adaptation of materials to meet varying reading needs.	Instructional materials are assigned to meet individual needs and levels. Supplementary or illustrative materials are frequently integrated with the lesson. A variety of materials are used creatively in the classroom.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

3. **Demonstration of the Effective Use of the Process of Teaching Reading**

LOW	HIGH
There is little evidence of lesson structure beyond that given in a commercially planned teacher manual or guide. The lesson seems unrelated to the needs of the students and does not make use of all available materials and resources. A lack of knowledge of fundamental structure of the language and of the phonetic and structural generalizations which are useful in reading is evident. Inaccurate examples are frequently used. No systematic method exists by which the teacher attempts to organize lessons in a flexible manner to meet the needs of individual students.	The lesson, even when modeled on that in a teacher's guide, has been adapted or supplemented to fit varying student needs. Accurate use is made in the instruction of the generalizations about language which determine pronunciation, syntax and meaning. Intervention is made when needed and steps are taken to lead children to correct responses, if necessary. Performance is evaluated through standardized and informal tests. Conferences are conducted when necessary with supporting personnel such as guidance counselors and social workers.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

7. Application of Reading Skills

LOW	HIGH
The practices employed in guiding reading during reading lessons are not evident in other subjects, such as social studies or science. Vocabulary and concepts are not developed. Great dependence is placed on "round-robin" oral reading as a means of covering textual materials.	Lessons in other subjects which involve reading of textual or reference materials are developed as directed reading activities. Vocabulary study, concept development, purposeful questions which necessitate the application of reading skills to textual materials are part of the lesson. Where necessary additional direct instruction in reading skills related to content materials is provided.

1 3 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

8. Relation of Reading Content to Experience

LOW	HIGH
The content of the reading materials is unrelated to the experiential, ethnic or cultural background of the children using them. Value judgments portrayed reflect a narrow or biased viewpoint.	The content is related to the experiential, ethnic and cultural background of the child and reflect the mores of his society realistically.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

9. Attention to Individual Differences Beyond Differentiation of Materials

LOW	HIGH
Little use is made of informal diagnostic techniques to determine individual needs or achievements. No time is taken during the instructional period to work with individual students. Seat work assignments are done by all children regardless of need or level of instruction. No subgrouping for instructional purposes is evident.	The reading lesson is planned with the needs of particular students in mind. Each student's progress and reading needs are noted in the teacher's records. He is given additional reinforcement, if needed, or moved into new or more challenging materials as his individual rate of achievement indicates. His placement in any instructional group is determined by his individual needs and interests.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

10. Effective Use of Grouping

LOW	HIGH
The class is organized in instructional groups based on achievement levels. These groups are formed at the beginning of the school year and remain intact with minor exception during that year.	Instructional groups within the classroom are formed and dissolved as the objectives for which they were formed are met. Children move from group to group as changes in interests, needs and achievement indicate. A child may work with more than one group or may work alone when it is profitable.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

11. Skill in Diagnosis

LOW	HIGH
There is little evidence of the effective use of standardized or informal test results to determine a child's reading status. No use is made of oral reading inventories to confirm that materials given a child are within his instructional or independent reading levels.	Data from both standardized and informal reading scales are used in determining individual instructional programs. Informal oral and silent reading inventories are repeated periodically to make sure the materials given and the group placement of each child are appropriate. During the class period observations which indicate particular needs or progress in reading of an individual student are noted.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

12. Encouragement of Free Reading

LOW	HIGH
No books for independent or leisure reading are available in the classroom. No effort is made to encourage reading through displays, rewards or provision of time for such reading. Reading stories to children for enjoyment or using the library are not encouraged.	Interesting books and information about books are displayed in the classrooms. Children are encouraged to join book clubs, talk about books and take advantage of library facilities. Time during the school day is provided for teachers, librarians or aides to read to children and for children to read books of their own choice.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

13. Teacher Personality

LOW	HIGH
The authoritarian atmosphere of the classroom creates an attitude in the children ranging from indifference to hostility. Negative reinforcements are used frequently. Teacher biases toward individual children can be discerned.	Positive reinforcements are frequent. The friendly concern of the teacher for the children is evident. The respect and affection of the children for the teacher indicates their acceptance of her. The teacher's attitude demonstrates both understanding and tolerance.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

Appendix B

Appraising Growth in Reading:

A System of Observation

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DIVISION OF RESEARCH
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

Directions for Completing Coding Sheet for Appraising Growth In Reading

The purpose of this guide is to permit controlled observation of a reading program by the classroom teacher. The system consists of a number of categories referring to selected teacher characteristics and the nature of the classroom environment. All categories are given on a coding sheet used for recording the observations. Definitions of key terms used in the categories are given in the attached glossary.

The procedure is as follows:

1. Become familiar with all categories, referring to the glossary if there are any questions concerning the meaning of any key terms.

2. Place one of the following codes in the column on the coding sheet for each category.

CODE

3 If heavy emphasis is given to the category in the reading program

2 If moderate emphasis is given to the category in the reading program

1 If little emphasis is given to the category in the reading program

0 If no emphasis is given to the category in the reading program

N If the category does not apply

GLOSSARY

Definition and description of certain key terms used in the guide are given below.

TERM	MEANING
1. Antonyms	1. Words opposite in meaning
2. Community and school resources	2. Audio-visual aids, trips, resource people, pets, and things brought in (from home, from outdoors--by pupil, by parent, by teacher--that is, from anywhere by anyone)
3. Comprehension	3. Understanding
4. Experiential reading	4. Gaining information from personal experience
5. Homonyms	5. Words same in sound but different in spelling
6. Independent study	6. Independent work-type reading in preparation for a class or a school activity, independent reading for recreation, or teacher working with an individual on his needs.
7. Self-help	7. One example is learning new words without help from other persons
8. Synonyms	8. Words similar in meaning
9. Teacher-pupil planning	9. Teacher and pupils together planning next steps
10. Vocalization	10. Making a sound using the larynx (voice-box)
11. Word analysis	11. The ability to learn a new word by breaking it into parts the meanings or sounds of which are already known
12. Word meaning-contextual	12. Getting a new word through relating it to the idea believed expressed

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Appendix C

Action Study of Schools in Disadvantaged Areas Differing in Achievement

Principal's Interview Guide

1. Did you have any experimental or demonstration programs, other than ESEA Title I projects in your school in 1966-1967?

   Title of Program: _____

   _____

   Last year? Title: _____

   _____

2. What proportion of the classes in your school moved relatively intact from grade to grade from 1966-1967 to 1967-1968?

   Check one:

   80%-100% ___ 60%-80% ___ 40%-60% ___ 20%-40% ___ 0%-20% ___

3. The evaluation staff wishes to amplify pupil mobility data already obtained from the period report (SD 1001). Please enter the following estimate: What per cent of the pupils in your school have remained in school for the entire school year 1966-1967? _____%

4. Please estimate what proportion of the families of your pupils are usually represented at PTA meetings?

   10% or less
   25%
   50%
   75%
   90% or more

5. In your judgment are there basic issues of disagreement between the P.T.A. and the faculty of the school? Yes ___ No ___

   Please identify the main areas.

6. Approximately how many school volunteers participate in the school program during a typical week?

7. How effective do you consider the general support of the school by the parents?

   Very effective
   Effective
   Ineffective
   Very ineffective
   Harmful

   Please comment briefly.

8. How effective do you consider the general support of the school by members of the community other than the parents?

Very effective
Effective
Ineffective
Very ineffective
Harmful

Please comment briefly.

9. Do your teachers follow the individualized reading approach, predominantly? _____ If you wish to explain your answer briefly, please do so.

10. On the basis of school policy and your own observation and supervision, approximately how many hours per week are devoted to classroom instruction in the following respects.

For the average pupil,

in reading, _____ hrs.

in language arts other than reading _____ hrs.

For the remedial pupil,

in reading _____ hrs.

in language arts other than reading _____ hrs.

11. Please indicate the extent to which problems created by disruptive pupils, interfere with your efforts to improve instruction?

Does not hamper this function
Slightly hampers this function
Sometimes hampers this function
Frequently hampers this function
A very serious obstacle to this function

12. Please indicate the extent to which problems created by irate parents, interfere with your efforts to improve instruction?

Does not hamper this function
Slightly hampers this function
Sometimes hampers this function
Frequently hampers this function
A very serious obstacle to this function

13. Please indicate the extent to which problems created by uncooperative community, interfere with your efforts to improve instruction?

Does not hamper this function
Slightly hampers this function
Sometimes hampers this function
Frequently hampers this function
A very serious obstacle to this function

14. Does your school have a class or classes for intellectually gifted children?

Please briefly describe the following:

a. Pupil selection criteria

b. The effect of the program on participating IGC children.

c. The effect of these classes on the school as a whole.

15. Do you have any special library programs in your school?

Please describe briefly.

16. For each of the following specialized teaching positions, please indicate the number of such positions in your school, and briefly describe how you use the position.

Position	Number	Description
Corrective Reading Teacher		
Above Quota Teacher		

17. Do you feel that the District Reading Consultant is helpful in your school's reading program?

Please explain briefly.

18. How would you evaluate the assistance given to your school by the School Community Coordinator?

    Please explain briefly.

19. If you were asked to select the most effective element of your schools program - including staff, programs or facilities - which element or elements would you choose? Why?

20. Do you have any relatively unique or unusual elements in your schools educational program which you consider effective? Please explain briefly.

21. Have you organized any special programs of the guidance program, or placed special emphasis on any aspect of guidance in your school. Please explain briefly.

22. How important to the educational program of your school is the work of the Guidance Counselor. Please comment briefly.

23. What are the duties of the cluster teachers in your school during the 11 periods for which they are not assigned to relieve teachers for preparation periods.

24. What specific arrangements of cooperation are made between the cluster teacher and the teacher who is relieved.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Appendix D

February 1968

Action Study of Schools in Disadvantaged Areas Differing in Achievement

School Data Form

School __ _____ District _____

Address	District Sup't.	Date of Appointment	Date of Appt. to School
_____ __	Principal: _____	_____	_____
_____	Asst. Principals: _____	_____	_____
Local Community _____	_____	_____	_____
	_____	_____	_____

'66-'67		'67-'68
	School Secretary	
	Prekindergarten	
	Kindergarten	
	CRMD	
	Low I.Q.	
	Special Guidance	
	Junior Guidance	
	Classes 1-6	
	Opportunity Class	
	Library	
	Swimming	
	I.G.C.	
	Health	
	Kindergarten Ext.	
	Sight Conservation	
	Health Conservation	

STAFF

'66-'67		'67-'68
	OTP	
	Cluster	
	Corrective Reading	
	N E Operation Understanding	
	Community Relations	
	Administrator	
	Language Enrichment	
	Grade Coordinator	
	School Community Coordinator	
	N E Coordinator	
	Non-Graded Primary	
	Auxiliary Teacher	
	Music (Enrichment)	
	H.E. (Enrichment)	

'66-'67		'67-'68
_____	Total	_____

Average Daily Register 1966-1967 _____

Average Daily Attendance 1966-1967 _____

Total Number of Classes _____

E.S.E.A. Title I Participation

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

Other Special Project _____

Transitional _____ Special Service _____

Per Cent Free Lunch _____ Per Cent Low Income Register _____

Per Cent Negro _____ Puerto Rican _____ Other _____

First Grade New York State Percentile _____

Reading - School Means

Grade

	2	3	4	5	6
October, 1966					
April, 1967					

Appendix E

FACTORS OF EDUCATIONAL SUCCESS IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS

OBSERVER INTERVIEW GUIDE

The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Division of Research

February 1968

2. Grouping

LOW	HIGH
Grouping of pupils for instruction is based upon rigid classifications according to a single variable such as IQ or reading scores or purely for administrative convenience.	School policy provides for flexible grouping of pupils depending upon the educational purpose at a given time. Both small and large groups are used to facilitate instruction. Short-range grouping and regrouping are employed for specific instructional purposes as needed. Membership in the groups varies according to pupil needs and the specific goals to be achieved. The effectiveness of methods of grouping is evaluated periodically.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

3. Pupil Access to School

LOW	HIGH
The doors of the school open at a prescribed time each morning and close at a given time each afternoon. Pupils are instructed to leave the building by a given time. No one is allowed to enter or leave the building and doors and gates are kept locked during the day.	Teachers, librarians, and other personnel are available to provide individual students with after school, remedial or enrichment work, guidance, and counseling at student's request. The school is open, the library is available and teachers arrange their schedules to allow for time to work with individual students after school. A variety of clubs, sports, music, and other activities are provided in a noncompetitive supervised setting.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

4. Pupil Growth and Development

LOW	HIGH
The educational program focuses primarily upon the acquisition of subject matter. Individual differences are not considered. Little effort is devoted to developing creativity and problem-solving skills.	The educational program focuses both upon individual differences and subject matter. It fosters pupil creativity and problem-solving skills. Physical, emotional, social, and intellectual competencies of pupils are developed. Stress is placed upon desirable behavior and attitudinal changes, in addition to the acquisition of subject matter.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

5. Student Activities

LOW	HIGH
Staff members dominate activities and do not support the program or encourage students to participate. Appropriate programs of student government or student activities are not encouraged. When they do exist, they are perfunctory and superficial. Activities provided during the day are extremely limited. Voluntary after-school activities are not provided.	The school and the staff encourage a variety of desirable student activities. Comprehensive programs in the arts, sports, and hobbies are conducted during school hours and after school hours on a voluntary basis. Adequate supervision is provided for each student activity. Continual evaluation of activities is employed, to insure that all segments of the student population have opportunity to be involved in the program. Activities are geared to the economic level of the community.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

6. Communication with Staff

LOW	HIGH
Little effort is made by administrative and supervisory personnel to communicate with the staff. Available information often consists of hearsay and rumors, which leads to confusion and low staff morale.	Administrative and supervisory personnel inform all personnel of school policies and procedures. Various appropriate methods are used, such as meetings, bulletins, newsletters, committees, personal conferences, workshops, and handbooks. Written communications are clearly phrased to avoid misunderstanding. Teachers readily discuss matters of concern with the administrators.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

7. Planning and Scheduling (Administrative)

LOW	HIGH
No deviation from a rigid schedule or plan is allowed. The only vehicle for introducing new ideas is the total school faculty meeting. Supplies and audio-visual equipment must be ordered far in advance.	Teachers are encouraged to work within a flexible structure, to plan in teams, to try new methods or materials on an individual basis, and to share their ideas with others in small meetings of subject matter or grade level teachers. The procedures of taking children away from the school during the day are simplified to allow field trips to be planned quickly. Prepared audio-visual materials such as TV programs utilized to fit in with the interests of the class. Several classes may be brought together to view a program or film.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

8. Planning and Scheduling
(Individual Staff Members)

LOW

Many faculty members lack the competence to structure their schedule in a flexible manner. Teachers are disinterested in cooperating with other staff members in innovative practices. Little or ineffective use is made of available equipment and supplies. Activities such as field trips or visitations are limited and routine in nature.

HIGH

Most faculty members are willing to organize and are capable of developing a flexible, innovative program within the classroom. Although they are critical of new, unproven practices, they are willing to use new techniques of demonstrated value. Effective use is made of accepted activities, such as field trips and visitations.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

9. Staff Growth and Development

LOW

Most staff members do not participate in inservice training opportunities. Little or no effort is made to continue graduate studies or professional activities.

HIGH

The majority of staff members continue graduate study and inservice training beyond the level required for certification. Many staff members have traveled in foreign countries and the United States.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

10. Working Conditions

LOW	HIGH
Teachers have no time during the day when they are not responsible for supervising children. Teachers are on call during any free time.	Provision is made for teachers to have periods of free time during the day. Separate lunch rooms and lounges are provided. Each teacher has a classroom, office or desk for his materials.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

14. Guidance Program

LOW	HIGH
Guidance counselors are not assigned to the elementary school. If counseling services are available, pupils seldom see counselors except in emergency situations and for disciplinary reasons. Counselors relate ineffectively to students, parents and staff.	Classroom teachers attempt to give students the opportunity to develop close relationships. Specialized guidance personnel are employed who maintain close working relationships with the teachers, parents and students. Each pupil is scheduled to visit his counselor several times annually and more often when desired. Counselors function as supporting personnel and not as administrators.

1	2	3	4,	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

15. Health Services

LOW

Health services are limited or used ineffectively. A lack of coordination exists among health personnel, teachers, and administrators. Pertinent student information is not gathered or is not made available to other staff members. Students and parents are reluctant to make use of the health services.

HIGH

The services of health personnel are adequate and competent. Extensive and effective use is made of available services.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

16. Libraries

LOW	HIGH
Libraries are poorly stocked and understaffed. If the libraries are well stocked and staffed, students and staff do not use, or are discouraged from using the facilities. Classroom libraries have few books which tend to be either dated, in poor condition, or infrequently used.	Library facilities conform to standards recommended by the New York State Education Department. Collections include magazines, newspapers, pamphlets, map, globes, atlases, films and material on local history. Each classroom has a supplementary library. All library facilities are accessible to students. Librarians, pupils and teachers work cooperatively. Flexible schedules permit students to use facilities independently and in small and large groups.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

17. Materials and Equipment

LOW

Classrooms contain few supplementary materials other than basic maps and charts. Most instructional materials and equipment, including texts, are obsolete and badly in need of repair. An instructional materials center is not available. If materials and facilities are available, they are used ineffectively or not at all.

HIGH

The school has a well-planned instructional materials and resource center consisting of at least a library and audio-visual center staffed by a coordinator. The school has an instructional services facility in conjunction with the library or housed separately.

Educational television and radio and various programmed self-instructional materials are used throughout the school system as supplements to the instructional program.

All instructional materials, printed and nonprinted, are evaluated periodically for their contribution to instruction and are kept up-to-date. Materials and equipment are used regularly and effectively and are available to teachers on short notice.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

18. Physical Surroundings

LOW	HIGH
Classrooms are equipped with immovable desks. All rooms are approximately the same size. Standard equipment is limited to chalkboard and other stationary or built-in equipment.	Provision is made for a variety of arrangements within the classroom by rearranging desks and for variety of class size by provision of large lecture rooms, regular classrooms, and small seminar rooms. Overhead projectors and screen, tape recorder, charts, etc. are available.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

19. Non-Teaching Duties

LOW	HIGH
Teachers are expected to fulfill a variety of roles in addition to that of instructor. They must serve as clerks, monitors, and supervisors by taking attendance more than once during the day, collecting money for a variety of purposes, keeping track of various noninstructional material and monitoring halls, toilets, and lunchrooms.	The instruction of children is th primary concern of teachers. Extra time is provided for the preparation of non-instructional materials, such as attendance reports. Teacher aides or other nonprofessionals supervise halls, buses, and lunchrooms. Attendance and grading are simplified by computerization.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

20. Pupil Personnel Services

LOW	HIGH
Pupil personnel services are not available, or if available, are inadequate or ineffective. Students and staff members do not make use of available services.	Pupil personnel specialists, such as psychologists, school social workers, attendance personnel, teachers of homebound and handicapped, speech therapists and counselors are available to meet the needs of the staff and students. Results of special services to pupils are promptly reported to their classroom teachers. A high level of rapport exists between pupil personnel specialists, other staff members, students and parents.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

21. Supplies

LOW

Limited supplies are available only upon request from a central office supply room. No provision is made for typing or duplicating services for the staff.

HIGH

Teachers are able to obtain supplies such as paper, ditto masters and pencils as needed. Sufficient secretarial staff is provided to type and duplicate needed materials. Provision is made for students to buy materials such as pencils and paper in the school. Effective use of supplies is made by the teachers.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		Low

COMMENTS

22. Community Involvement

LOW

No attempt is made to involve parents and community persons in the day-to-day workings of the schools.

HIGH

Parents and the community are involved in decisions about curriculum and are used as resource persons. Where feasible, members of the community play a role, through elected representatives, in the hiring of teachers and administrators.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS

26. Service to the Community

LOW	HIGH
School facilities are not available for community use after school hours or during vacation. Parents and students are discouraged from using the facilities.	The community is encouraged to use school facilities and services. Staff members are active in community organizations, such as churches and youth groups. Facilities are used after school hours and during vacation by members of the community for a variety of educational, social, and recreational activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

STAFFING SURVEY: _____
Name of School

		Current Staff Number of Each
Elementary Administrative and Other Services Staff		
1.	School Principals	_____
2.	Assistant Principals	_____
3.	Assistants to the Principal	_____
4.	Supervisors	_____
5.	Guidance Personnel	_____
6.	School Physicians	_____
7.	School Nurses	_____
8.	Dentists	_____
9.	Dental Hygienists	_____
10.	School Psychologists	_____
11.	School Social Workers	_____
12.	Visiting Teachers	_____
13.	Speech Therapists	_____
14.	_____	_____
15.	_____	_____
16.	_____	_____
17.	_____	_____
	Total	_____
Elementary Instructional Staff (K-6)		
1.	Prekindergarten Teachers	_____
2.	Kindergarten Teachers	_____
3.	Special Class Teachers	_____
4.	School Librarians	_____
5.	Physical Education Teachers	_____
6.	Music Teachers	_____
7.	Art Teachers	_____
8.	Foreign Language Teachers	_____
9.	Corrective Reading Teachers	_____
10.	Classroom Teachers	_____
11.	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____
13.	_____	_____
	Total	_____
Para-Professional, Clerical, Custodial and Cafeteria Staff		
1.	Teacher Aides	_____
2.	Tutors	_____
3.	Family Assistants	_____
4.	Parent Volunteers	_____
5.	Clerical Staff	_____
6.	Custodial Staff	_____
7.	Cafeteria Staff	_____
8.	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____
	Total	_____

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

P.N. 22-719 Appendix F May 1968

ACTION STUDY OF SCHOOLS IN DISADVANTAGED AREA DIFFERING IN ACHIEVEMENT

School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide

Coordinator _____ School District _____ Paired Schools: P.S._____, P.S._____

Interviewer _____ Date of Interview _____

1. As School-Community Coordinator, how long have you been familiar with the living conditions in the school zones (neighborhoods) in which children attending these two schools live? No. of Years _____
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

2. How would you rate the quality of housing in these two school zones, using the general quality of housing in your district as the standard?

	P.S. ____	P.S. ____
Well above average for the district	____	____
Slightly above average for the district	____	____
About average for the district	____	____
Slightly below average for the district	____	____
Well below average for the district	____	____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

3. What is the predominant type of housing in the two school zones?

	One Family	Two Family	Multiple Dwelling	Other
P.S. ____	____	____	____	____
P.S. ____	____	____	____	____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide (Continued)

4. Are there any housing developments in these two school zones?

P.S. _____: Yes ___ No ___ P.S. _____: Yes ___ No ___

Approximate age of development(s)	P.S. _____	P.S. _____
Less than 5 years	_____	_____
5 - 10 years	_____	_____
10 - 20 years	_____	_____
More than 20 years	_____	_____

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

5. Are there evidences that the living conditions in the school zones are different regarding

	P.S. _____	P.S. _____
Abandoned tenements	_____	_____
Absentee landlord	_____	_____
Crime	_____	_____
Libraries	_____	_____
Narcotics	_____	_____
Parks and play areas	_____	_____
Unemployment	_____	_____
Municipal services (e.g., fire inspection & protection, health clinics, etc.)	_____	_____
Other (special programs for children, etc.)	_____	_____

PLEASE EXPLAIN

School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide (Continued)

6. How would you compare the two schools concerning the extent of parent participation?

	Many parents participate	Parent participation varies with specific issues	Few parents participate
P.S. ____	___	___	___
P.S. ____	___	___	___

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

7. For those parents who do participate, how would you compare the two schools concerning the degree or intensity of participation?

	Very active	Active	Passive
P.S. ____	___	___	___
P.S. ____	___	___	___

PLEASE EXPLAIN

8. How would you characterize the efforts made by the school administration to secure greater parent and community participation in the school programs?

	Great Effort	Average Effort	Minimum Effort
P.S. ____	___	___	___
P.S. ____	___	___	___

PLEASE EXPLAIN

9. In your judgment is the image which the parents have of the school favorable or unfavorable?

P.S. ____ Favorable ___ Unfavorable ___

P.S. ____ Favorable ___ Unfavorable ___

School-Community Coordinator Interview Guide (Continued)

10. In your judgment what accounts for the favorable or unfavorable image of the school which the parents have?

	Pupil Achievement	Efforts Made Toward Parent Involvement	Other
P.S. ____	____	____	____
P.S. ____	____	____	____

PLEASE EXPLAIN

11. Can you mention the community organizations in the school district which give active support to these two schools?

Community Organization	P.S.	P.S.	Community Organization	P.S.	P.S.
_____	____	____	_____	____	____
_____	____	____	_____	____	____
_____	____	____	_____	____	____
_____	____	____	_____	____	____

Please explain the nature of this support.

Appendix G

COMPARISON FORM

COMMUNITY COORDINATOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

COMMUNITY FACTORS	A	A^1	B	B^1	C	C^1	D	D^1	E	E^1	F	F^1
Quality of Housing												
General Living Conditions												
Extent of Parent Participation												
School Efforts to Secure Cooperation												
Parental image of the School												
Support by Community Organization												

S = Slightly Superior

M = Moderately Superior

V = Very Superior

- = Neither School Superior

P.N. 22-719
May, 1968

Appendix H

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

CLASS SOCIOMETRIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: On the other sheet that you've been given you will find the name of every student in the class. Put a number on the line in front of <u>every</u> <u>name</u> except your own.

1. Are there any people in this room whom you would like to have as your <u>very, very best</u> friends? If so, place the number 1 in front of their names.	1	"Very, very best friends."
2. Put the number 2 in front of the name of every person whom you would like to have as a good friend. These people are not your very, very closest friends, but you would like them to be <u>good friends</u> of yours.	2	"Good friends."
3. Put the number 3 in front of the name of every person who is not a friend, but who you think is <u>all right</u>. These are people with whom you would just as soon work or play. You think they are all right. They are not friends, but they are okay just the same.	3	"Not friends, but okay."
4. Put the number 4 in front of the name of every person whom you <u>don't know very well</u>. Maybe you would like them and maybe you wouldn't. You don't know. Where you don't know a person well enough to rate them, put the number 4 in front of that name.	4	"Don't know them."
5. After you have given the numbers 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 to people in the room, there may be some names that you haven't marked yet. You know these people but they are not friends of yours and, in general, are <u>not okay</u> to you. Put the number 5 in front of all these names.	5	"Not okay."

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12224

LORNE H. WOOLLATT
ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER FOR
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

DIVISION OF RESEARCH
CARL E. WEDEKIND, DIRECTOR

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH
LOUIS A. COHEN, CHIEF
518: 474-6386

August 28, 1970

ERIC
U.S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202

Gentlemen:

Enclosed is one copy of a document acquired by the New York State ERIC Input Agent.

This document is being forwarded to you for routing to the appropriate clearinghouse and inclusion in Research in Education.

Please insure that the attached "Reply Card" is forwarded to the clearinghouse so they may notify us of the disposition of the document.

Thank you for considering this document.

Sincerely,

Gregory Benson, Jr.

Gregory Benson, Jr.
Assistant in Research

GB/amp

6. Guidance in Purposeful Reading

LOW	HIGH
Directions given for silent or oral reading set no real purpose. No effort is made to help children determine the appropriate rate (skimming, scanning, slower detailed) for reading. Oral reading in particular serves no real learning purpose.	Children are given specific purposes for reading. They are guided in determining rate and helped to develop the techniques which enable them to vary their reading rates to suit the purpose for which they are reading.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

CATEGORY	CODE
VIII. Teacher Characteristics The teacher has:	
38. Taken a workshop or course in reading in the last three years 39. Visit or observed reading in other classes 40. Consistently used reading clinic	
IX. Environment The classroom has:	
41. Displays to motivate reading 42. Library 43. Magazine subscriptions 44. Bulletin boards devoted to reading 45. Book clubs 46. Reading table or area	

COMMENTS

1. Evaluating Pupil Progress

LOW

The results of standardized tests are not related to the educational program and are not used for diagnostic purposes. Teachers are discouraged from developing evaluative instruments for special purposes.

HIGH

Specific procedures and instruments are used to evaluate pupil progress.

Decisions concerning pupils are based upon a variety of data, including pencil-and-paper tests, teacher-pupil and teacher-parent conferences, frequent observations. The staff selects standardized tests which are appropriate in terms of specific goals. The results are reported to classroom teachers and used to diagnose learning difficulties and improve instruction.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

13. Experimentation and Innovation

LOW

The staff stresses traditional methods of organization and instruction. The status quo is encouraged, while research, experimentation and innovation are discouraged.

HIGH

Innovative practices develop from a systematic appraisal of needs. Research, experimentation, and innovation are encouraged and funds are allocated for these activities. Staff members participate in curriculum planning, research, evaluation, and other activities designed to improve the instructional program. Research results are incorporated into specific activities.

Individual teachers are encouraged to use experimental methods of instruction and to share the results of such experimental methods.

Innovations include nongradedness, team teaching, programmed learning, and varied methods of classroom grouping.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

25. Reporting to Parents

LOW	HIGH
Reports to parents consist only of letter or percentage grades on academic achievement.	Reports to parents evaluate physical, social, and emotional development, as well as academic achievement. The philosophy on which the grading system is based is explained clearly and understandably on the reporting forms. Reporting forms contain space for noting behavioral achievement and for the informal comments of teachers. Information contained in the reports is based upon both objective and subjective data. Personal conferences with parents are regularly used to supplement written reports. Special committees comprised of professional staff and parents meet periodically to review current methods of reporting with a view to effecting desirable improvements.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

5. Emphasis on Literal Comprehension and Critical Thought Processes

LOW

Little time is spent on questions and discussion of material read silently or orally to determine the understanding children may have of the general or specific meaning of words, phrases, sentences and larger thought units. Questions asked require only location or recall of stated detail. Little effort is made to develop meaningful vocabulary beyond the word recognition stage.

Children are seldom asked to evaluate, draw conclusions about, or criticize the writer's content or his purpose for writing.

HIGH

The lesson includes questions and discussion of main ideas, relation of detail to main idea, meanings of words and larger units of language both in isolation and context. Instructional time is devoted to the development of concepts and of vocabularies which convey concepts.

An active participation by students in the evaluation and criticism of statements and ideas expressed by any writer is encouraged. Questions are designed to foster independent thinking. All opinions are respected even though this may reflect values different from those held by the teacher. The emphasis is placed on developing the ability to formulate sound generalizations and ideas through the consideration of specific written evidence.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

CATEGORY	CODE
IV. Vocabulary Development Vocabulary is developed through:	
19. Word analysis-auditory discrimination 20. Word analysis-visual discrimination 21. Word analysis-phonetic analysis and blending 22. Word recognition-sight vocabulary 23. Word meaning-contextual clues 24. Word meaning-synonyms, antonyms, homonyms 25. Use of dictionary-pronunciation and location skills	
V. Use of Books Pupils show ability to:	
26. Handle books 27. Use table of contents and index 28. Use library skills 29. Use various kinds of books 30. Demonstrates the ability to follow instructions	
VI. Teaching Method The teacher uses:	
31. Teacher-pupil planning 32. Community and school resources 33. Independent study for pupils 34. Other: Describe in "Comments"	
VII. Pupil Growth The class is growing in reading as shown by:	
35. Interest and enjoyment 36. Pupils helping themselves 37. Good eye movement, lack of vocalization	

SUMMARY PROFILE

	1 Low	2 2	3 Average	4 4	5 High
1. Evaluating Pupil Progress					
2. Grouping					
3. Pupil Access to School					
4. Pupil Growth and Development					
5. Student Activities					
6. Communication with Staff					
7. Planning and Scheduling (Administrative)					
8. Planning and Scheduling (Individual Staff Members)					
9. Staff Growth and Development					
10. Working Conditions					
11. Curriculum Study and Revision					
12. Strategy for Curriculum Change					
13. Experimentation and Innovation					
14. Guidance Program					
15. Health Services					
16. Libraries					
17. Materials and Equipment					
18. Physical Surroundings					
19. Non-Teaching Duties					
20. Pupil Personnel Services					
21. Supplies					
22. Community Involvement					
23. Contact with Community					
24. Public Information Program					
25. Reporting to Parents					
26. Service to Community					

12. Strategy for Curriculum Change

LOW	HIGH
Change is sought for the sake of change, with little or no thought given to the overall objectives of the school or needs of the student. Curriculum or instructional changes are frequently imposed by administrators without the involvement and cooperation of staff members concerned, and with little thought given to the individual differences or capabilities of staff members.	Planning for curriculum and instructional change follows the careful development of educational objectives. Community and students needs are considered. All supervisory personnel have the responsibility of developing concrete plans for carrying out curriculum and instructional changes with their staffs.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

24. Public Information Program

LOW

No attempt is made to keep the public informed about the operation of the schools. The attitude displayed by school system officials toward the various news media is uncooperative. Residents are poorly informed or misinformed about the educational program progress and problems of the district. The staff is not permitted to serve any function in informing the public.

HIGH

The school conducts a vigorous and honest program of public information which provides comprehensive news concerning progress, problems, and operation. The program includes bulletins, school publications such as newsletters and special reports, encouragement of participation in parent-teacher organizations, and the involvement of lay citizens in special study committees to study and make recommendations concerning various aspects of the educational program.

Staff members are helped in understanding their individual roles in public relations. A specifically designated staff member is responsible for coordinating the program of public information, and adequate budgetary provision is made for the program. The local teachers' association is recognized as having a rightful share in keeping the public informed about the schools.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

4. Provision of a Balanced Program of Instruction

LOW	HIGH
Little effort is made to provide opportunities for extension of reading into other language arts areas such as speech, literature or writing. One skill area is emphasized to the exclusion of others: e. g. phonetic word attack. The classroom program provides no opportunity for the development of individual interests in other kinds of reading activity.	The program in reading provides direction in all skills areas in proportion to immediate instructional needs. Enrichment is provided and reading interests are extended into other language arts. Although a basal reader may be the foundation, opportunities are provided for many other kinds of reading oriented activities, such as research, dramatization and written and oral creative expression.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

Coding Sheet for Appraising Reading Growth

Name of teacher (Last) / (First)	
School Code	
Class Code	
Date	
CATEGORY	**CODE**
I. Experiential Reading Pupils gain information by personal experience through:	
1. Observing	
2. Gathering relevant information	
3. Recording information	
4. Remembering information	
5. Using information	
II. Comprehension in Silent Reading Pupils show comprehension by:	
6. Noting details	
7. Interpreting ideas	
8. Locating main ideas	
9. Finding answers to questions	
10. Verifying a given statement	
11. Judging value and accuracy of material	
12. Reading for pleasure	
13. Reading to follow directions	
III. Facility in Oral Reading Pupils show facility in oral reading:	
14. Reading accurately	
15. Phrasing fluently	
16. Using appropriate expression	
17. Recognizing new words	
18. Making use of punctuation marks	

INSTRUCTIONS

The Observer Interview Guide consists of 26 topics, each of which is evaluated on a five point rating scale from "low" to "high." Paragraphs describing "low" and "high" practices are included for each topic. If any of the comments in the paragraph labeled "low" describe the school being observed, this category should be checked. However, a school must meet all the "high" specifications to be classified in that category. Schools which meet some but not all of the "high" classifications should be rated either 2, 3, or 4.

Practices classified as "low" range from undesirable to intolerable. Practices classified as "high" should be considered ideal with relatively few schools meeting these criteria. The observer can list specific recommendations or observations in the section provided for comments. After the individual topics have been completed, the ratings should be listed on the "Summary Profile."

The "Staffing Survey" should be completed either by the observer during the interview with the principal or by the principal. The number of employees in each position should be indicated. Positions other than those listed should be added.

This instrument has been adapted from a 1966 publication of the National Education Association entitled Profiles of Excellence: Recommended Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of a Local School System.

11. Curriculum Study and Revision

LOW

The study and revision of existing curricula is discouraged or activities are planned and conducted without involving the teaching staff.

HIGH

Each curriculum area is reviewed and evaluated periodically for its logical progression through the grades and its relationship to real-life situations. Curriculum reviews are based upon studies of social and economic trends and utilize the knowledge and skills of the professional staff, college and university personnel, and interested lay people. Experimentation and evaluation are conducted and use is made of the results of various curriculum projects conducted by other agencies.

1	2	3	4	5
Low		Average		High

COMMENTS

23. Contact with Community

LOW	HIGH
Members of the administration and special staff are aloof and difficult to contact. Parents do not know or are reluctant to discuss problems with the administration. Parents often express their dissatisfaction with the program and/or staff.	Parents freely contact administrative and special staff members and are encouraged to discuss problems with them. Parents know the names of administrators and special staff, such as guidance counselors and social workers. Evening meetings are arranged for parents who cannot visit the school during the day. As a result of these contacts, parents frequently express their satisfaction with the school.

1 2 3 4 5

Low Average High

COMMENTS